

[22nd March 1921]

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“ The Council will now resume discussion on the voting of demand for grants.”

II

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND II—EXCISE.

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYALU REDDIYAR :—“ Sir, it falls to my duty now to place before the Council Demand No. 2 for voting bearing upon excise, a transferred subject and as such under the Minister's charge. As, Sir, I am comparatively new to the Excise Department I have requested the Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter to help me with his services in discussing the resolutions that might be placed before the House. For that I beg leave of you. And as regards the resolutions, before they are called, I may be permitted to make but one observation and that is this. There are resolutions, among resolutions to be discussed, bearing upon curtailment of the establishment. Now I beg leave of the Council to state that they will allow me some time to judge and see what curtailment can take place. At present I am quite new to the department. From what I know probably there will be a possibility of curtailment, because we know as a matter of fact, while years ago there were 30,000 prosecutions, now there are only 5,000. So there is a possibility of curtailment; but I cannot yet say how much it will be. But one thing I can assure you that above all other departments, this department has been known to be the least corrupt. I advisedly say this. It is owing to the efficiency and discipline prevailing in the department. You may take it upon (shall I say) trust from me that the Excise Department has been fairly immune from charges of a sinister nature. That is my personal experience in the matter, even before I became a Minister. So in considering this demand, I would ask the House to bear in mind that the immunity which is enjoyed is due to the discipline that prevails in that department.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ The motion I beg to move is—

‘ 18. That in 6-A. *Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies*, the provision of Rs. 15·57 lakhs plus Rs. 15·34 lakhs plus Rs. 9·97 lakhs be reduced by Rs. 6 lakhs (Budget page 45).’

“ In this department I may say that the expenditure as compared with the income is very low, but at the same time if you just watch the progress of expenditure during the last ten or twelve years you will find that the expenditure has more than doubled itself. In the year 1909-10 the expenditure was 18·15 lakhs and the same level was kept up till the year 1917-18, when the expenditure under this head was 18·05 lakhs. In 1918-19, it rose to 21 odd lakhs, in 1919-20 it was 22 odd lakhs, in 1920-21, 25 and odd lakhs and this year it was budgeted for 31 odd lakhs. In all these figures, we are taking into account the expenditure which was due to salt. It is seen that during the course of four years, the expenditure has risen from 18 lakhs to 31 lakhs, i.e., more than 13 lakhs. In the year 1918-19, three lakhs was the extra expenditure and this was due to the grant of war allowances, to revision of pay of subordinate establishments and to construction of quarters and buildings in connexion with the extension of salt pans. Again, there was an increase of 1·50 lakhs in 1919-20. The increase is chiefly under establishment, war allowance, clothing and uniform. In 1920-21, there was an increase of 4·50 lakhs, i.e., 2 lakhs in excess over the budget estimate. I am not able to find out the reason why there should be an extra expenditure of 2 lakhs as compared with the budget estimate. Again, over the revised estimate, there is an increase of 6·50 lakhs according to the budget estimate of this year. And most of it is under almost all the heads. Therefore this growth of expenditure requires careful study

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

and retrenchment. I do see the difficulty of retrenchment but I feel at the same time that the increase of cost year after year is enormous and it is growing at a very rapid speed. Therefore it is better that we examine the whole question and see that no further increase is made in this department. That is the reason why I propose the curtailment of six lakhs in this department which is the extra amount budgeted for the next year."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—"May I rise to a point of order? We have got a number of resolutions, about five—relating to the deputy commissioners' salary. It is one of the items proposed in the grants which are now sought to be reduced by a lump sum. I believe under the rules particular items have to be discussed before a general resolution like this has to be taken up. So I think priority must be given to them, before a resolution of this nature is taken up."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I remember that rule. It applies to the whole demand when you reduce the allotment. That comes in in the end. The honourable member will turn to page 2 of the agenda—Motion for reduction of total grant. They come after the detailed heads. But I see the point of convenience mentioned by the honourable member. The agenda is not against the rules. But it will certainly be more convenient, if we take the other motions first. I see the point of the honourable member, but having taken the agenda in the present form I think we can continue on that line."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I want to say a few words on this question. The honourable mover has given some general statements as to why a large curtailment should be made. I may now give a few instances where the curtailment ought to be made. Taking page 45, we have got first the three deputy commissioners. I believe the Royal Commission's report clearly says that these deputy commissioners are not at all necessary as intervening between the Commissioner and the assistant commissioners. The Government has been ready (of course I am speaking subject to correction) to give effect to the various recommendations of the Commission's report in increasing the emoluments, increasing the numbers, etc. I think they should give effect to this recommendation also. Even supposing that the recommendation is not clear, I think it is absolutely unnecessary that these three deputy commissioners should be there. Because they are in charge each of seven or eight districts, there is absolutely no reason why they should be there, except that they may be able to travel for a few months through the various districts doing nothing substantial. Government admit the number of offences has considerably fallen. Therefore these intermediate officers may not be necessary."

"Next comes 13 assistant commissioners. I think we can safely reduce it by half because the inspections which were half-yearly before have now been directed to be annual. These assistant commissioners are generally for the purpose of touring and inspecting the various circles. I suppose I am right in saying that. Therefore, half the number of these assistant commissioners is enough and that would save a large amount. The Inspectors do all the important work of the administration. Then comes the question of assistant inspectors. I would like that all the posts of assistant inspectors are abolished or most of them. Assistant inspectors have no special work. They are only asked, generally speaking, to assist the inspectors in touring and other things. As the Government have already stated that the offences have considerably gone down, there is no necessity for this cadre of assistant inspectors."

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [22nd March 1921]

"We are told that 15 per cent or so of the personnel of this department has been curtailed, but I should be very glad to know where this curtailment has been made. I am told that this curtailment is generally in the cadre of clerks and of peons. There seems to have been no reduction made in the higher departments.

"I do not think I need join issue with the Honourable Member in charge of this department and discuss whether this department is the least corrupt of all departments. All that I should like to say is that offences seem to be going down, though the Hon'ble Mr. Subbarayulu Reddiyar has told us that wherever a Salt officer goes, he is able to detect some offence."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—"It is not a question of Salt officer. It is a question of preventive staff."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR (*continuing*) :—"When I said Salt officers, I meant only these assistant inspectors of Salt and Abkari. I do not think there is any separate staff. Let us then consider what work there is for these assistant inspectors, sub-inspectors and inspectors who are in the temporary cadre. Of course some of them are necessary for the manufacture of salt and other things, but most of them are for what they call sweet toddy inspection, and it seems to me that so far as this is concerned, there is no necessity to continue this temporary establishment."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"On page 45, under the heading 'Personal allowance to assistant inspectors' Rs. 6,240 has been allowed. I do not see any reason why that should be allowed in addition to temporary additions to salary—Rs. 34,320."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"It is a mistake. It is temporary additions only—Rs. 34,320."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"In that case, I do not say anything about it. On page 47, there is a big item—Rs. 4,10,000 towards travelling allowances. This is too much for the department, I think. Under that item a good deal can be saved."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"Sir, I have got to oppose the reduction for this reason. This is one of the departments which have been transferred to the Ministers and in which it is possible for us to get some money. To put forth for the sanction of the Council, a wholesale reduction like this, about 6 lakhs and odd, without giving any particulars as to how this sum of 6 lakhs has been arrived at, I submit, is not in the interests of the administration of the Excise Department. If we really want that transferred subjects which have been assigned over to us should be conducted in a manner which will show that we Indians are fit for further responsible Government and if we want that further subjects and departments should be transferred to us, it is essential that we should get more money into our hands and it is for that reason and for that reason alone that I am opposed to this reduction. I am one of those who would like to have the country dry, but unfortunately for our country, it is not possible to have it now. Such being the position, I would like to ask my honourable friend Mr. Narasimha Raju, in view of the political advancement of the country, and taking into consideration the future of our political career to see that in the ten years which has been promised to us as the time-limit, we have got to get further departments in order to attain our salvation, it is best for us not to reduce this department in which we are able to get so much money. The amount that we get is very large, about 5½ crores and the total amount of expenditure

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

comes to about 48 lakhs and odd—I am taking the whole of it including non-votable charges. Therefore I submit that it would be in the interests of all that we ought not to vote for any reduction. Therefore I submit, Sir, that it will be to the interest of all of us, if we are not to reduce this allotment. The position which the Ministers occupy to-day may be occupied by us to-morrow and when we occupy that position, if we go in for cutting down the excise administration, we might find ourselves helpless. Therefore I submit, Sir, that this reduction ought not to be voted for at all."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"Sir, it appears to me that we are discussing the whole of the resolutions on this unfortunate department at once and I am afraid it would be very difficult for me to dispel all the misapprehensions that have arisen in the course of the discussion within the short space of five minutes."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The honourable member has got ten minutes."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"Well, Sir, I have been associated with this department for a quarter of a century while my Honourable Colleague who is now in charge has been associated with it, as he has said, for little more than a quarter of a year and I am afraid even ten minutes will be very little for all that I should like to say. I may take the staff from the bottom first of all, the rank and file. It has been asked on the other side why we should not reduce the superior staff but not the rank and file. In the matter of corruption, it is the rank and file that is generally most to blame. The rank and file has been reduced since I joined the department in 1896 by very nearly 2,500 men. The next stage is that of the sub-inspector. The sub-inspector is employed both in salt factories and in ranges. His work in the salt factory is to supervise the manufacture of salt and in other places he is employed in preventive and detective work. We have heard of instances from the Ceded districts in the recent debate which show how very inadequate our force of sub-inspectors is, to control the evil practices of the reddy and others of those parts. The assistant inspectors come next and have been objected to on the ground that they only assist the inspectors. This is quite a mistake. The assistant inspector is the officer in independent charge of a factory. There are 64 factories in the Presidency and all these are under the direct charge of assistant inspectors. There are also assistant inspectors for temporary work, such as the men who look after the sweet juice tapping. One of the most difficult problems of the whole department is to allow the legitimate tapping of juice for sugar and to distinguish between that and the illegitimate tapping of juice for toddy, and after a great many trials and experiments, we withdrew the control of the tapping of juice for sugar from subordinate officers and put it under the control of higher paid officers who are deputed to see that as little crime as possible takes place in connexion with this tapping, while at the same time there is as little interference as possible with the legitimate trade. I think that if the honourable member could go through the reports on this matter with me, I could satisfy him that the introduction of these officers has resulted in a great improvement on the previous state of things. Above these assistant inspectors and sub-inspectors are the inspectors, above them are the assistant commissioners, and above them all the deputy commissioner. The whole pyramid is built up, as my Honourable Colleague has said, on a system of very efficient and incessant discipline, and if we did not have such incessant discipline, we should have a world of corruption. The actual number of inspections now made is as follows: The inspector inspects every factory once in three months and he spends not less than three

[The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter] [22nd March 1921]

days at the factory. While he is there, he sends the assistant inspector into camp and he does the whole work with his own hand. That is a plan that is likely to bring corruption to notice, if there is any going on. He inspects every range once in six months and every salt refinery twice in a season. The assistant commissioner inspects every circle once a year and spends six days on the inspection. This inspection again is very thoroughly done. For instance, the audit inspection of the accounts is not a mere examination at random of an item here and there, but a complete examination of every scrap of paper that relates to the accounts for a period of one week, which is selected for the purpose. Again, if there is any regular corruption going on, it is very difficult for it to escape detection in the course of an audit like that. Similarly, the assistant commissioner inspects every factory once a year and spends two days over the inspection, and every range once in two years. The deputy commissioner, who is at the top of the pyramid, has not been specially mentioned in the criticisms and is to be dealt with in a later resolution. I can only say here that I do not think the honourable member who said that the Public Services Commission had pressed for the abolition of this post, is correct. Personally, I should be very sorry to see the post abolished and I think the subordinate staff would be very sorry too. Let me here refer again to the case of the Ceded districts. Honourable members from those districts have told us that there is wholesale illicit distillation under the patronage of the influential reddy, and that the local staff are conniving at it. Let us suppose that we send to an area like that a young Indian of the educated classes of high character and good physique, say, a boy who has been the captain of his cricket eleven, and tell him to try and put down illicit distillation in such an area. A boy like that has two courses in front of him, he may fall in with the rest of the staff, take a share of the payments by the reddy, receive his pay, get his promotions and live happily and peacefully, or he may try conscientiously to do his duty by the department in which case in the first place he runs the risk of having his head cut off."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Hear, hear"

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"I am surprised to hear that the honourable member approves the murder of sub-inspectors. When I say that there is risk, I am speaking of an actual instance in which a sub-inspector did have his head cut off in Malabar. I might cite another case in the Ceded districts in which a sub-inspector used a pistol with the result that a man was wounded in the leg and afterwards died through neglect of the wound, and the sub-inspector, who was perfectly justified in his action, was tried for his life and convicted, but acquitted on appeal to the High Court. These are some of the risks to which an honest man must expose himself, and in any case he must expose himself to a life of great hardship, in attempting to detect illicit distillation in all sorts of weathers, generally at nights in lonely places in the *vankas*, and having done this if, as is suggested, his superior officer is corrupt, all that he earns for it is the enmity of his superior officer, whose neglect he has exposed. This is where the assistant and deputy commissioner come in. They see the report of a satisfactory piece of detection like this and make a point of looking into the record of the man, who has been responsible for it as well as into that of the inspector who has allowed the illicit distillation to go on unchecked, and the result is that merit is recognized and corruption of the kind which has been hinted at made extremely difficult.

"Now that I have explained the details of the various grades, I would ask honourable members who wish to see reductions made, to examine the question as one affecting all ranks of the department at once and not to pick out particular ranks for reduction. As regards the department as a whole, I have already said

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

that we have been making reductions from time to time. I myself, as Secretary to the Commissioner, prepared a revision scheme in 1898, and in 1906 I was Secretary to the Indian Excise Committee, which suggested another considerable reduction. As Commissioner, I made a further reduction in 1918, and the net result, as I have already told the Council, has been a reduction of nearly 2,500 men. It is true there has been some increase of late years in the senior ranks. The reason for this was that we had to double our production of salt in order to supply Bengal during the war and we had to employ more men to open up and man the new factories.

"I would here invite the attention of the Council to the fact that the department we are criticizing performs two functions, namely, the control of the Salt revenue as well as that of the Excise, and that the practice is, after deducting certain items of expenditure which are purely concerned with Salt, to divide the cost of the remainder in the proportion of two to Salt and one to Excise. The increase in the last two years has been almost entirely in the Salt branch.

"However, as my Honourable Colleague has said, we are perfectly willing to examine the question and have already begun to do so. The plan on which we are proceeding is as follows:—We take up the ranges one by one and find out the ranges in which there has been no crime of importance for some years past and then see whether we cannot, by readjustment of the ranges, reduce the number of sub-inspectors. If we can reduce that, we can reduce the number of higher controlling officers, but I should like to warn the Council that there are considerable dangers in a too wholesale reduction of staff. I have already drawn attention to the fact that we have lost control over illicit distillation in the Ceded districts. In another province in which reduction of staff and of shops was carried too far, the Government had to admit that more than half the liquor drunk was illicit. It would be quite easy to show a falling revenue and a fall in the figures of licit consumption, if that was what was wanted; but I am sure that this is not what the Council want; if such figures were secured at the cost of a large increase in illicit consumption, and if total consumption is to be reduced to the point of extinction, I am afraid what the Council will find is that they will have not to reduce the staff, but to increase it. We have difficulty enough in controlling illicit distillation now when there are licit shops available. If there were no such shops, the difficulty would be greatly increased. I may here instance the fact that a short while ago, I received a complaint from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of the prevalence of drunkenness in a certain village in which he was interested. I made enquiries and replied to him that I did not understand how this could be so when there was no liquor shop in the village. He replied that the shop he complained of was not a licensed but an unlicensed one, that there had been little trouble so long as the licensed shop was maintained, but that since its removal its place had been taken by an illicit shop and drunkenness had greatly increased.

"Lastly, I should like to urge that we cannot make a large arbitrary reduction by a stroke of the pen. What we have done in the case of the reductions that we have made previously is, first of all to stop the filling of vacancies until further orders while we make our enquiries and then when we have decided what reduction we can make, to adjust the reduced staff to the reduced number of posts until all the men who are in permanent employ are absorbed. It is no economy to turn off men whom you have to compensate for the termination of their services."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"It occurs to me on looking into the agenda—Honourable members will see it from the revised agenda issued by the Secretary this morning—that it will probably be conducive to a more satisfactory debate if this general motion for the reduction of the whole sub-head is put off for some

[The Hon'ble the President]

[22nd March 1921]

time. It is also in consonance with the rules, and I think it will be more satisfactory if some detailed provisions are disposed of, so that the House will be in a position to know clearly what effect they have had on retrenchment and that will probably make the debate on this motion easier. If the House would allow me to alter the agenda slightly and leave the discretion to me, I would let this motion come up a little later. Have I the leave of the House to do so?"

The House signified its assent.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Let this debate stand over, that is, the one on the motion of Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju and to which the Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter has replied. We may take it up at a later stage. I would now ask the House to take up the motion about deputy commissioners' salaries—Motion No. 5 in the revised agenda—by Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar. Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar also, I think, has got a proposal regarding the deputy commissioners' salaries."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"May I ask a favour, Sir? I wish to have the privilege of replying to the Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"When that question comes up, I will give a correct ruling."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"I wanted to know it, because I have been referred to very often in the course of the reply, and it is but fair that I should be allowed an opportunity of meeting the references."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The debate has not ended. It has only been adjourned."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"Sir, I propose—

4. *That the sum of Rs. 1,50,360, the portion provided for Deputy Commissioners' salaries be deleted in Detailed Account No. 6-A (Budget page 45).'*

"There seems to be a mistake in regard to the framing of the resolution, as the resolution is only in regard to the pay of the deputy commissioners. The total figure appears Rs. 1,50,000 and odd. My main reason why the deputy commissioner's salary should be deleted is this. We have a large number of assistant commissioners who have been given increased pay and who are responsible men. They can sufficiently supervise the inspectors. The inspectors are also officers who are getting very decent pay; and I believe there is even a proposal to raise the pay of the inspectors, but I have nothing to do with it now. The deputy commissioners have got each about seven or eight districts, and I do not think they are required to inspect a particular number of them or that they are bound to carry out any inspection. I believe that, so far as the assistant commissioners are concerned, they have certain duties fixed by the department—I speak subject to correction—and I believe the deputy commissioners are not bound to inspect and they cannot be supposed to supervise the assistant commissioners, especially when there is the Commissioner of Salt and Abkari who is also responsible to the Member for Excise. I think there is too much of supervision which is quite unnecessary. It seems to be more or less like a post office, as all the papers should pass from the assistant commissioners to the deputy commissioners, then to the Commissioner and again to the Government. We have also got in the Revenue Board, the Commissioner of Salt, and what is the necessity for the deputy commissioner? I do not say that the Deputy commissioners do not make any inspection or that they are absolutely useless, but we do not get a sufficient return for the expenditure we incur on the salary of these

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

deputy commissioners. Why should they be expected to travel over seven or eight districts without any limitation whatever? Without any restriction they go to district after district. Whereas to-day the deputy commissioner inspects Tinnevely, he can go tomorrow to Tanjore, and day after tomorrow he can inspect Madura and even Rāmēsvaram. That is why I brought forward a separate resolution regarding the reduction of travelling allowances. I therefore think that the House will agree with me that there is too much of supervision which can be very well avoided; there can be no harm in Government giving more powers to assistant commissioners and I do not see why they could not be asked to do the duties of the deputy commissioners. I therefore hope that the House will agree with me in reducing the grant for the salaries of the deputy commissioners."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR then moved —

'5. That in 6-A. Excise the provision of Rs. 1,50,360 be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000, the pay of three Deputy Commissioners and six Assistant Commissioners (Budget page 45).'

In doing so, he said:—"Mr. President, so far as deputy commissioners are concerned, my resolution is a bit different from that of

11-45 a.m.

Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar. I want the pay of three deputy commissioners to be deleted, and my reason is this. There are now four deputy commissioners, one of whom is in charge of distilleries, salt factories and other scientific works. That officer cannot be abolished. It is only the three other deputy commissioners that are in charge of divisions that we can abolish. So, for that reason I have confined my resolution to the deletion of the pay of three deputy commissioners. With regard to these officers I was closely following the Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter, when he made the reply on behalf of the Government on the previous resolution, and I could not find any justification for the retention of the deputy commissioners. The inspectors are the chief executive officers, and over them we have the assistant commissioners to supervise and above them the deputy commissioners and above them we have got again the Commissioner at the headquarters. While the assistant commissioner himself is a supervising authority, we have got the deputy commissioner over him. This sort of a double intervention of supervising authorities is not seen in other departments. There is one other department perhaps where such is the case, but it is no justification for retaining the deputy commissioners in this department. As was pointed out, these deputy commissioners have no specific duties, except that of supervising the ordinary work in addition to the assistant commissioners. The assistant commissioners are asked to go and supervise the ranges in their charge once in two years. I believe in the old days it was once in a year and now it has been changed to once in two years. That is the reason why I want in the other part of the resolution that the number of assistant commissioners should be reduced. It seems to me, Sir, that no case has been made out for retaining the deputy commissioners who will only be an additional supervising authority to the assistant commissioners. With due deference to what the Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter said, I may say that the Public Services Commission has stated that there is no necessity for these intervening officers. I believe it is on page 358 of their Report—I have got the reference but I am sorry I did not bring the book. There we see it stated that this double intervention is unnecessary and one of them may go. The assistant commissioners are more in number and they will be able to do more supervising work. That is why it is well that the deputy commissioners who are fewer in number may go. Finally, if the Hon'ble Minister who stated that he was prepared to go into the general question of retrenchment and see

[Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar]. [22nd March 1921]

whether any reduction was possible will promise that he will examine this question and see what reduction he can make in this particular matter, I, for my part, would not press this further."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" We are now dealing with Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar's motion to delete the sum of Rs. 1,50,360 provided for Deputy Commissioners' salaries and also Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar's proposal to reduce the allotment by one lakh, the pay of three deputy commissioners and six assistant commissioners. I think we had better take that aspect for discussion. If necessary we can take the vote separately."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. FODHUNTER :—" May I begin, Sir, by taking up Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar's challenge regarding the opinion of the Public Services Commission? Here is the passage from the report to which he referred : ' It was suggested that the Madras cadre had too many administrative posts, and that only one inspecting agency was required between the Board of Revenue and the officers whom we have called the Superintendents. It is clear that the supervision now exercised is very close, but we are not prepared to say that it is excessive in view of the class of officers now being recruited.' Now, it cannot be stated on the strength of that passage that the Public Services Commission recommended the abolition of the deputy commissioners."

" I am very glad to have this opportunity of explaining to the House what the deputy commissioner does do. I have myself been a deputy commissioner for two years, and I can assure the House that I was not a post office nor had I an idle time. It has been stated in the first place that there are no corresponding officers in other departments. Well, I ask what about the deputy inspector-general of police and the superintending engineer, who are corresponding officers in other departments? The deputy commissioner fulfils the duties of both of these in one sense or another. The chief function, I take it, of the deputy inspector-general of police is to look after personal questions in a department in which there is a very large number of subordinate officers to control. In the Salt Department there are 1,152 sub-inspectors. The deputy commissioner is the appointing authority, and a very large number of personal questions arise, questions of appointment, promotion and punishment, and a large part of the deputy commissioner's time is taken up in going about and getting to know the men. Without some grade of officers who are in touch with all these men, proper control would be impossible. It is perfectly impossible for a single Commissioner at headquarters even to know all the Inspectors. Hence the chain of superior controlling officers, every link of which is very necessary for the purposes of the department."

" Again, the Salt Department is a very self-contained department. It makes its own buildings and roads; it very seldom goes to the Public Works Department for help; it makes its own machines, it makes its own clothing; and in other ways a great deal of work that other departments have done for them is done for itself by this department. When new salt factories have to be made, they are made by the department; the quarters are built by the department, the roads are made and altogether the whole factory is completed without outside help. The sanctioning authority for all the larger estimates is the deputy commissioner and he is the man who sees that the work in all branches is properly done. In these ways his work corresponds to the work of a Superintending Engineer."

" Again, it is a very big trading department. We are making 110 lakhs of maunds of salt a year and we sell a similar amount. This means a very big business. I appeal to the business men in this House to say whether it is possible

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

to run a business of that magnitude without branch managers first to decide the quantity of salt to be made at each place and then to put it to sale. If these processes were not properly controlled, you might have too great a production of salt at one time and a serious shortage at another time, when salt was badly needed. You cannot have these things controlled without branch managers.

"Then again there are the very important questions of closure of shops, of rates and duties and general questions of policy, in connexion with which the deputy commissioner is the chief authority who deals with the broad outlines of the questions and keeps in touch with the collectors and officers of other departments, so that, as I have said, his work is by no means that of a post office or his life an easy one.

"Again, it has been said that deputy commissioners can be abolished, because the number of inspections has been reduced, that whereas in the former days they had to be continually following out their programme of inspections, nowadays they wander about at their sweet will and pleasure. I propose to read certain extracts to show that this is an erroneous idea. What has really happened is that the number of obligatory inspections has been reduced in order to give deputy and assistant commissioners more time to attend to the places where inspection is really needed. The following is an extract from the order on the subject which explains this point: 'deputy commissioners ought to be far more closely in touch with their assistant commissioners under the new system and many important matters that are now settled after much delay and correspondence ought to be disposed of by personal interviews and local inspection. No fixed programme of inspection is laid down for deputy commissioners for the present, but they will be expected to inspect a circle whenever they have reason to think that there is something amiss with its administration. When a local inspection takes them to any circle that has not been recently inspected they should make a point of inspecting it while there. Deputy commissioners can only keep in touch with all that is going on in their divisions by spending the major portion of their time on tour and they will be expected to do so. The number of inspections laid down in the annexure is to be regarded as a minimum, and one of the objects of this revision is to enable deputy commissioners, assistant commissioners and inspectors to devote special attention to circles and ranges where the administration is weak; and in such cases inspecting officers should make a point of ascertaining at an early date how far their instructions are being carried out. All officers should avoid making their inspections in a regular order or after a fixed interval of time, and their visits should as far as possible be unexpected so that they may have a chance of seeing things as they really are and not be misled by careful window dressing.'

"I think I have said enough to show that the deputy commissioners, so far from being superfluous, have got a large number of specific duties to do, and, so far from not inspecting, are required to inspect places which need inspection.

"There remains the statement that the deputy commissioners can be abolished because the assistant commissioners have recently been given an increase of pay. As to this, I can only say that the assistant commissioners have not yet received any increase, and that when they do receive it, it will certainly not be on a scale more than proportionate to that which has been given to all the other departments."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I want to confine myself to the question of deputy commissioners. The Hon'ble the Finance Member has explained to us the manifold duties of the deputy commissioners, and I think most of the members

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[22nd March 1921]

will agree with me that his attempt has not been very successful. It looks as though the Government have been put to great trouble to find out what work the deputy commissioners are doing. It is said they are busy with inspection work, with making appointments, punishing people, sanctioning expenditure on buildings and things of that sort. I think there is the assistant commissioner who can do and is doing all that work, and the intermediary appointments over and above the assistant commissioners are superfluous. They appear to be more or less sinecure appointments. I went into the question of their qualifications, and I find they are not considerable. I found the letters A, B, C, D, E against their names, while I expected to see B.A. and M.A. The letters A, B, C, D, E really indicated that they had passed the Salt Manual examination, Customs tests, and other examinations like that mostly with the help of books. I think that these appointments are really unnecessary because their work requires no special knowledge and all that work is already being done by assistant commissioners. The Honourable Member for Government mentioned that on questions of policy the deputy commissioners were consulted. The deputy commissioner, when consulted, very often detains and sends in some form or other the views of those below him. For this work, there is the commissioner who may well be expected to look into these matters, and in my opinion the mediation of these deputy commissioners is quite unnecessary."

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I give my whole-hearted support to the resolution moved by the Negapatam member, Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar, but I fear I shall have to differ from Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar in his resolution which, as appears from its wording, seeks to reduce the number of assistant commissioners from thirteen to six. It is rather hard to have these reductions in both ways, and if the Council ultimately resolves to give up or to delete these three deputy commissioners, I think it will be more appropriate to retain the whole lot of thirteen assistant commissioners. On going through page 45 of the budget so far as the Excise Department is concerned, it does not appear to be poorly or inadequately manned. We have a large number of sub-inspectors and above them about one hundred and fifty assistant inspectors, and above them about ninety-four inspectors and above them about thirteen assistant commissioners; and, as pointed out by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, there is absolutely no reason for the retention of an intermediary whose position I can compare only to a conduit pipe or to post office between the commissioner over him and the assistant commissioners just below him. Therefore, in these circumstances, I feel constrained to vote for the reduction, or for the complete reduction of three deputy commissioners at the same time retaining the whole lot of assistant commissioners about 13 in number."

MR. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, it is an admitted principle that when a certain number of men are deputed for work over specific tracts, it is essential that there must be one person to look after their whole work in order to co-ordinate, to co-operate and also to direct the specific work which those persons assigned to that locality have got to do. If that principle, which, I believe, nobody in this House will demur to, is to be extended to this department as well, then we will see, Sir, that the work of these assistant commissioners, who are given certain tracts to manage, will have to be checked, co-ordinated and also in other ways directed by somebody else. It is pleaded here that for this, or for all these things, it is not essential to have a man on the spot. I believe we are very familiar with the theory of the man on the spot. In spite of all its defects, I believe it has got its own good points. We will take only the good point in that

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

theory and taking it we will find that instead of one commissioner alone sitting at the headquarters of this Presidency and trying to manage all the assistant commissioners throughout the Presidency, may I put it to you, Sir, and to this House also, whether it would not be possible to divide the whole Presidency into three or four portions and allot to each of them separate person asking them to assume responsibility for the whole of the work that is done there, and have this commissioner at the top of the whole administration to see that the whole thing is conducted according to the directions given by the Government. If that is the principle upon which any system of administration is to be based, I submit, Sir, that no objection ought to be raised to this appointment. Time may come when the Government may find it possible to reduce the three deputy commissioners. When this department has reached its perfection, it might be possible to reduce the three deputy commissioners and some of the assistant commissioners as well. But standing as we are when the complaints made by Mr. Sivasankaram Pillai, I believe, and also by Mr. Kesava Pillai are ringing in our ears that a lot of illicit distillation is going on in the Presidency, or at least in some portions of their own district, may I submit, Sir, with these complaints ringing in our ears, is it not right and proper that we should have one man at least on the spot who will be able to go to these places for very urgent cases and also to check and to direct all the work that is necessary? It is only for this reason, Sir, that I am constrained to vote against this reduction."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar and I have been referred to very often by the Hon'ble the Finance Member and by my honourable friend who has just sat down. They said that our complaint about illicit distillation in our single district shows that we want more men to suppress it. The man on the spot, as my friend put it, the deputy commissioner, seems to have been ignorant that such a thing had been going on in the Ceded districts, and even the assistant commissioner also seems to have been ignorant of the same. It is a notorious fact that there has been this illicit distillation and the Hon'ble the Finance Member has spoken of some abkari subordinates suffering at the hands of some of these other people who manufacture illicit arrack. That is so, and it is known: and it is rather feared that the more zealous subordinate officers have not the proper support of the higher officers. So far as I have known, the deputy commissioner's post in the mufassal is something of the nature of a white elephant. They know very little of the conditions that exist in a place. They go about from place to place, of course accompanied by assistant commissioners, salt inspectors and sub-inspectors. I do not know if they make surprise visits in those parts where illicit traffic prevails and which are not unknown to the Government officials, Collectors and Superintendents of Police. They have not paid any surprise visit to these places in order to detect the offence. I think that the brunt of the ordinary detective work falls on the ill-paid sub-inspectors, and if they were paid a little more, I should be glad. The deputy commissioners' posts, I think, can very well be abolished with great advantage to the department and to the public purse. Of course the Hon'ble the Minister has with his conspicuous ability eulogised the high character and cleanliness of the department as a whole, but I am afraid I cannot subscribe to all that he has said. Of course there are good men and bad men, and the department, I know, has got a bad flavour about it. We should expect the Minister to make a reasonable reduction. I believe the Hon'ble the Minister would be fulfilling the hopes of the people if he would reduce these bloated establishments, some of them carrying very high salaries though they are not of much public use, and make that public money available for educating the people. I do not believe he has not

[Mr. P. Kesava Pillai]

[22nd March 1921]

known the state of things: he is shrewd enough to understand them, but as Minister he has paid a formal compliment to his department. With all that I think he can very well bend his mind to effect a reduction in these overgrown establishments for educational purposes."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"May I say one word, Sir, about the pay of this 'bloated and over-paid' establishment? There are altogether in the budget four posts of deputy commissioners. One of these is the Abkari deputy commissioner, a special distillery expert, with whom I understand the Council have no desire to interfere; one is a member of the Indian Civil Service, who has been appointed by the Secretary of State. There remain two appointments which are on the strength of the department. The assistant commissioners draw a rate of salary more or less corresponding to that of deputy collectors, but with nothing corresponding to the selection posts. So what the provision amounts to is this: that the bloated establishment of two posts of deputy commissioners corresponds more or less to the selection grade of the deputy collectors, and I hope therefore that, if the Council decides that there should be no deputy commissioners, they will allow the assistant commissioners to have a selection grade."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The motion can be more conveniently put by expanding it a little. I am asking the Council to vote on two resolutions—a resolution by Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar to delete the sum of Rs. 1,50,360 being provided for the salaries of deputy commissioners, and also a motion of Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar to reduce the provision of Rs. 1,50,360 by Rs. 1,00,000 being the pay of three deputy commissioners and six assistant commissioners. Let me point out at once, if Honourable Members would refer to page 45 of the budget, it will be found that the allotment of Rs. 1,50,360 is for the pay of three deputy commissioners and thirteen assistant commissioners. Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar proposes to delete the whole of it. Of these deputy commissioners, only three items are votable; one is not votable being held by an Indian Civil Service Officer."

The motion for cancelling the appointments of three deputy commissioners was then put to the Council and declared lost, 20 members voting for it and 52 against.

Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar did not press his motion and it was allowed to be withdrawn.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"May I remind the Honourable Members that the time allotted for this subject is three hours? By lunch time we shall have to close this discussion. So if it is the intention of the House to utilize that time to the best advantage, Honourable Members will be well advised to act upon the advice I gave yesterday and distinguish between the more important and the less important items. Having said that, I would ask the Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Raju whether he wishes to move his motion to delete the sum of Rs. 60 (Motion No. 7)."

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"I wish to know, Sir, whether in connexion with the revenue administration it was stated that this allowance is given in order to compensate for loss of pay. If that is so, of course, I do not wish to move it."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"This particular allowance, Sir, is an allowance of Rs. 5 that was given as a confidential allowance. The Salaries Committee recommended that confidential allowances should be abolished. We

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter.]

did not think it fair to cancel the allowance of a man already drawing it and therefore we have provided for continuing it until he gets his promotion."

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju then withdrew the following motion :—

7. *That the following item of duty allowance under the following head be omitted :—*

6-A. *Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies—to typist to Board's office (Budget page 47) Rs. 60*

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—"I beg to move—

8. *That in 6-A. Excise the following provision be deleted :—*

Rupees 6,240, personal allowance to assistant inspectors (Budget page 45).

9. *That in 6-A. Excise the following provision be deleted :—*

Rupees 1,000, personal allowance to petty officers (Budget page 47).

"Regarding the question of personal allowance, I should like to know what this personal allowance means. If it only means the compensation that is paid for any loss incurred by the office establishment owing to revision of the scale of pay, I have no objection to the personal allowance being given. If it is not so, I will press the motion."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"Mr. President, Sir, the personal allowances in question are the difference between what these officers are now receiving, including the temporary allowance, and what they will receive under the scheme of revision. We do not want them to suffer on account of this scheme coming into force. We shall have to continue to pay them what they are getting now."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—"Then I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"What does the honourable member say in regard to his proposal to reduce the sum of Rs. 2,41,800 provided for assistant inspectors by Rs. 30,000?"

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—"I understand from the Honourable Member in charge that he is going to examine the question. That is only a general reduction in the establishment. If he is going to do that, I do not want to press the motion."

The following motion was then by leave withdrawn :—

6. *That the sum of Rs. 2,41,800 provided for assistant inspectors be reduced by Rs. 30,000, the pay of 15 assistant inspectors of preventive circles (Budget page 45).*

The following three motions were taken up and discussed together, being identical :—

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

1. *That the lump provision of Rs. 1,27,000 for the revision of the pay of the officers of the department in 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies be reduced by one lakh (Budget page 45).*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

2. *That under 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies, the lump provision of Rs. 1,27,000 made for the revision of pay of the officers of the department be omitted (Budget page 45).*

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

[22nd March 1921]

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

3. *That the lump provision of Rs. 1,27,000 made for the revision of pay of the officers of the department in Detailed Account 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies be omitted (Budget page 45).*

MR. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Yesterday it was stated that this subject would be submitted for the examination of the Finance Committee. If this is the case, I do not propose to move my motion.”

RAO BAHADUR A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“I wish to move the resolution, Sir. It suggests that the lump provision of Rs. 1,27,000 made for the revision of pay of the officers of the department be omitted. It will be remembered that, so far as this scheme is concerned, it appears from the answers furnished to us that it has not yet been sanctioned by the Secretary of State. This lump provision is made in order to provide for the contingency of an increase of pay of these officers in 1921-22. I think it unnecessary to retain this provision for two reasons. One is that when the revision proposals are finally sanctioned, Government will be in a position to consider in the light of the information furnished by the Hon'ble the Finance Member whether it will not be possible to effect any retrenchment and then make the necessary provision only to the extent to which it is found absolutely necessary. It has also to be remembered that there are proposals under consideration to effect retrenchment in all grades of service. It has also been pointed out that, in pursuance of the instructions of His Excellency, a committee is going to sit very shortly and make proposals to effect retrenchment in the various departments. A circular is proposed to be issued to the heads of the various departments inquiring whether they can work out the departments with a reduction in their establishment. When these steps are going to be taken and when the Hon'ble the Finance Member says that he is going to examine the whole question, is there any necessity for retaining this lump provision even before the scheme is sanctioned by the Secretary of State? If after the examination of the proposals by the Finance Committee to be appointed, and any further examination by the Hon'ble the Finance Member, it is found absolutely necessary to provide for an increase, I will ask whether it is not possible to incorporate it in the budget for the year to come. We know that when some increase of pay is sanctioned in the course of the year, there is nothing to prevent the Government to provide for it. When it can be so done, it is certainly objectionable to provide this lump sum of Rs. 1,27,000 making it impossible to have any improvements in education or other departments. By deleting this provision for which there is no necessity at present, we will be in a position to find funds for more important purposes.”

RAI BAHADUR T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“I wish also to move this resolution on the ground that there may not be found any present use for this money. On the other hand, it may be lying idle till the sanction is received from the Secretary of State. Another reason is this: we find no details whatsoever as regards the mode in which the revision is to be given effect to and we are absolutely in the dark. For these two reasons, I beg to move that this lump provision may be omitted for the coming year. If any necessity should arise and if the committees that are going to sit over this matter decide that any revision should be made and any additional pay should be given, the matter can be brought in the shape of a supplemental budget, and the necessary sanction obtained. Till then there is no use of retaining this money idly instead of utilizing it for more urgent purposes.”

THE HON'BLE MR. C. G. TODHUNTER :—“Mr. President, Sir, I must express my surprise at the Hon'ble Mr. Krishna Rao's urging this resolution. Yesterday

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

when we were discussing the deputy collectors, he was one of the members who urged that it was 'unjust, inequitable and uncharitable' to penalise one class of officers while every other department was having its share of promotion as a result of the recommendations of the Public Services Commission. This provision is for the share of the Cinderella of all the departments and the honourable member wants to cut it out or postpone it at any rate till next year. Why should this one department, which is already harder worked and worse paid than most others, be penalised? Yesterday we were discussing duty allowances and my honourable colleague on my left called evidence as to the hardships undergone by the Settlement officers. With your permission, Sir, I will also call evidence, in this case, that of the late Mr. G. W. Steevens. Here is what that unbiassed and independent critic wrote in 1899 of the work of the Salt officer: 'The Assistant Commissioner wore a khaki uniform, a braided jacket, and a crown on his shoulder-strap; yet he did not look like a soldier. He looked overworked and underfed. His eyes were pools in pits of socket; the bones cropped out of his cheeks and chin. He looked like a man who was always travelling, eating sparsely and irregularly of jungly food, often down with fever, oppressed by unrelenting anxiety.' He goes on to say 'his work is cruelly hard. At any minute of the night he has to get up to inspect the guards posted round the factory, or hurry for hours to surprise illicit manufacturers. Now he toils forward on horseback, now he flounders afoot through marshes and sliding sand-dunes, now crouches in a sluggish boat on a rank canal. When he falls ill—and of necessity he is often put down in festering fever-beds—he will likely enough have to shiver and sweat for a week in a canal-boat before he can so much as see a doctor. Month by month, blistered with sun, quivering like a leaf with ague, no time to lie up, his English tongue going rusty,—and by way of compensation for his lonely labour he receives £125 a year when he begins, and after fifteen years or so will perhaps be enjoying £300.' These salaries have not been revised since. He goes on then to describe the process of salt manufacture and says, 'that is all—except crushing sun and blinding white glare and all penetrating salt-dust for the Salt officer. In the hottest part of the hottest days other men get under roofs: that is just the time that he must be out all day in the sun. The factory is a chessboard of twinkling brine and snow-white salt, more scorching to the eye than flame. While his eyes are being toasted before a quick fire, salt-drifts are banking up in them and in his ears and his nostrils and his mouth. He looks round, and, like Lot's wife, becomes a pillar of salt. With it all, the few Salt officers I have seen appear to grumble almost less than anybody in India. They say it is a healthy life—as long as you are well; when you begin to be unhealthy at all, you are quickly very unhealthy indeed. Perhaps one reason for their comparative contentment is that they are justly proud of their department. For in Salt, as in most things connected with Revenue, Madras sets an example of efficiency and honesty to the whole of India'. (Hear, hear.)

"That is an independant witness and that is the life of the department to which it is proposed to deny the improvement in salaries which has been given to other departments. It is complained that we have not given the details in the budget. The sole reason for that is that the matter is under correspondence with the Secretary of State and it would be unwise to give the details and publish them before they have been approved by the Minister and before they have been examined by the Finance Committee. The whole scheme is ready. It is not a question of a lump allotment for proposals yet to be worked out. We are perfectly willing for it to be examined by the Finance Committee. One reason why it has come back is that the Government of India desire that it should be examined

[The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

[22nd March 1921]

by the Minister before it is put into force. I hope the Council will take that as sufficient guarantee that we shall not be passing extravagant proposals and wasting the money of the tax-payer. I hope Honourable Members will not ask us to postpone either indefinitely or for a year this measure of justice to the Cinderella of the departments."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I do not wish to press the motion to a division. But I wish to point out that there is nothing to cause surprise to the Hon'ble the Finance Member in my urging this resolution. I expressly stated that this lump provision is unnecessary, and that the whole thing may be examined to see if any retrenchment is possible. I did not suggest anything that could afford room for him to think that I was partial to any officers. In view of the statement that the Hon'ble the Minister is going to examine the question and the Finance Committee is also going to examine the proposals, I do not press the motion to a division."

All the three motions were by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu was deemed to have been withdrawn as the member did not move it :—

10. *That under 6-A. Excise—Salaries the lump provision of Rs. 4,050 for teachers in salt factories be omitted (Budget page 47).*

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

11. *That the travelling allowance of Rs. 4,10,000 under 6-A. Excise be reduced to Rs. 2,00,900 (Budget page 47).*

"I am aware that this provision of Rs. 4 lakhs and odd is provided for meeting the increased allowances that have been recently sanctioned. I am not going to question that. My object in proposing reduction of this allowance was to minimize the travelling and to see that unnecessary travelling is not resorted to. Consistently with what I have said with reference to a previous resolution, I propose that this reduction be made so that only in cases where it is necessary and only in regard to matters where the personal attention of the officers is necessary, they should make an inspection. Otherwise if the allotment is not reduced they will think that they have got so much to be spent and naturally there will be an inclination to spend much. If it is reduced there will be no such inclination. It is with that object, I say, that the allowance should be reduced."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"I am quite ready to examine the allotment and see if we can cut it down. But if the idea is to stop travelling, I don't quite see how we can do that."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The honourable member from Negapatam did not propose to stop travelling but only to reduce it. The Hon'ble the Finance Member is willing to examine it from that point of view."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"I am afraid I can hardly undertake to minimize the travelling of an officer whose sole duty is inspection. That is the difficulty of the position; if we can legitimately reduce the sum set down for travelling allowance, we will gladly do so. But where an officer's sole duty, like that of an assistant commissioner in charge of a preventive subdivision, is to inspect all the year round and where he has a programme of inspection to get through, if we are going to say 'You shall not inspect more than six months in the year', we must alter the whole scheme on which their work is built up or we shall have them

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

sitting idly at headquarters while there is work to be done in the circles. We are ready to do what we can legitimately do in regard to that matter."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. M. D. Vadavoss not being present, his motion was deemed to have been withdrawn—

12. *That under 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies the sum of Rs. 4,10,000 under travelling allowances be reduced by 1 lakh (Budget, page 47).*

Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao did not make the motion No. 13, standing in his name—

13. *That in 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies—Commissioner's Office, the duty allowance of Rs. 60 to typist of Board Office be omitted (Budget, page 47).*

The motion was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I beg to move—

'14. *That the provision of Rs. 4,86,000 made for petty constructions and repairs under Contingencies in Detailed Account 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies be reduced by Rs. 2 lakhs (Budget, page 48).*'

"On turning to page 48 of the book it will be noticed, Sir, that Rs. 4,86,000 is now provided for petty construction and repairs. At the same time we have not got any idea as to what this petty construction is and what these repairs are. On turning to the third column as regards the revised estimates of the current year you will find Rs. 2,50,000 only is provided for the current year, and the actual amount that was spent on this head for 1919-20 was Rs. 2,56,766. We don't know why there is so much increase in the coming year. Secondly, I thought that in the absence of details I might, under the present financial conditions, reduce this amount by 2 lakhs and I think that even if we hope that we may be able to spend a large amount on construction and repairs still, as a matter of practice, we find that so much amount is not actually spent at the close of the year. So my suggestion is : why should we have a large amount provided for here, so that it may lie idle after all at the end of the year. My another reason is this. If you read a few columns down you will find there is another item of petty construction and repairs for Rs. 1,98,000. When you have got another item like that which is also an increase over the previous year's, I fail to see why you should have Rs. 2,36,000 provided for in excess over the present revised estimate. For these reasons, Sir, I submit that the provision may be cut down by 2 lakhs."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of a similar resolution—

'15. *That the provision of Rs. 4,86,000 under 6-A. Excise for petty construction and repairs be reduced by Rs. 2 lakhs (Budget, page 48).*'

"Sir, the absence of details in respect of the budget expenditure amounting to Rs. 4,86,000 is my only justification for moving this resolution. I hope and trust that the Minister in charge of the department will give us details to dispel our illusions in which case I shall be delighted not only to withdraw the resolution myself but also to persuade my honourable friend Mr. Narasimhacharlu to do so. I am awaiting a detailed statement from the Honourable Member."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"I am glad to have that assurance, Sir, I think I can satisfy the Honourable Members in a moment. To begin with,

[The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter] [22nd March 1921]

these provisions relate entirely to Salt which is a central subject and it is only as a result of the arrangements under which the charges of the joint department are divided that they come into the Excise budget at all. Even under Salt there are two classes of works. The first of these is what are called Salt Licensees' works. These are the works referred to in the entry 1,98,000 which is a printer's error for 98,000. That is purely a Salt item and is deducted from the total charges of the joint department before the division between Salt and Excise is made. After the deduction, the balance is divided up into two-thirds which is charged to Excise and one-third which is charged to Salt. In case there should be any idea that this is unfair to Excise, I should explain that, while Excise pays two-thirds of the remaining works of which the majority are in salt factories, Salt pays one-third of the preventive staff in the districts in many of which there is no salt crime. To come now to the second item for petty construction and repairs, the facts which account for the increase are that during the war we had to make a very large increase in the salt factories in order to supply salt to Bengal, but while doing so we cut down the expenditure as much as we could on account of the war. We are therefore still fitting up six of the factories which are being retained to make them complete. In the case of Tuticorin, which is a very large producing factory, we have not yet given the licensees facilities for getting their salt away and we have therefore now provided for roads and railway sidings. Elsewhere, there are considerable provisions for repairing the quarters for the peons which have fallen down, or fallen out of repair during the war. Honourable Members will therefore see that the bulk of the charges are for salt works and under these circumstances I hope they will not press the resolution."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The Honourable Member will please explain whether Salt is purely a Government of India matter and whether the expenditure is wholly debitable to the Government of India."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"Not entirely, Sir. Salt licensees' works are entirely debited to Salt. But the charges for petty construction and repairs are divided."

The motions were by leave withdrawn.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR then moved—

'16—That the provision of Rs. 1,98,000 for petty construction and repairs under 6-A. Excise be reduced by Rs. 1 lakh (Budget page 48).'

In doing so, he said.—"Mr. President, when I gave notice of the resolution it struck me that there was a mistake somewhere, either that 1,98,000 was a mistake for 98,000 or that the total figure was a mistake. I now find on going through the errata that the former is a mistake. On that ground my resolution automatically falls. The fault lay more with the printer's devil than with anybody else."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao was not made and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

17. That under 6-A. Excise—Contingencies the grant of Rs. 5,000 proposed for subsidies to private educational institutions situated at or near salt factories be omitted (Budget, page 48).

Motions for reduction of the total grant were then taken up.

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju again formally moved his motion discussion on which was deferred—

18. *That in 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishments and Contingencies the provision of Rs. 15.57 lakhs + Rs. 15.34 lakhs + Rs. 9.97 lakhs be reduced by Rs. 6 lakhs (Budget, page 45).*

MR. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Mr. President, I have given notice of a motion later on for reduction and I do not propose to move it. So I wish to say now what I have to say on this subject. Mr. Arumainatha Pillai referred to the fact that it is a transferred subject and therefore we need not be chary of reducing the expenditure. That it is a transferred subject is a matter of gratification only if the excise revenue is not so administered as to increase the consumption of liquor or as to keep the consumption of the liquor stationary. It is only if the policy of the Government is to reduce the consumption and show results as soon as possible that there can be any agreement with the position that the money that can be got under this department is money which may be usefully spent for other purposes. I know I am taking on this question a view, which may differ from the views of some members of this House. I do expect from the Hon'ble the Chief Minister a statement of policy as regards what he is going to do for the reduction of consumption. Last year's administration report showed clearly that the consumption in country spirit increased and also in toddy. In this state of things I think the administration of a transferred subject like this will be more a matter which will impede the progress of self-government rather than a matter on which we could congratulate ourselves. I quite agree that the officers and the establishment of that department so long as they exist, should be looked after properly. The general administration of the department is the only question with which I am concerned. I must express my own deep dissatisfaction with the way in which the department has been administered till now. I can only hope for a proper policy being laid down by the new Minister whom I congratulate most heartily upon being put in charge. I shall be able to congratulate him only if he will be able to reduce it. It is only with that hope, I suppose, that that department has been transferred. It is not transferred for the purpose of making it a gold mine, for the purpose of finding revenues for other purposes. Education may be a good subject. But still this mode of raising revenue should be looked at very closely and on its own merits. I feel certain that I have not got the monopoly of it and I believe that every body will co-operate with me in giving expression to the same sentiment and I am sure that the Honourable Minister will not be behind me in giving equal expression to it and regulate the administration in the way in which it ought to be done.”

THE HON'BLE DIWAN BAHADUR A. SUBBARAYALU REDDIYAR :—“ I hope I shall deserve the honourable member's congratulation, Sir. I will strive my best to reduce the consumption provided at the same time the Council gives me permission to increase the staff to avoid illicit distillation.”

MR. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“ We had till now, Sir, a number of resolutions where we found certain items of expenditure were sought to be curtailed. Now we come to a resolution which is very general and after the assurance given us by the Minister for Excise and the explanations given us by the Hon'ble the Finance Member, I think we can very well trust both of them to do their level best for introducing the principle of retrenchment, or to use the figure of the Hon'ble the Finance Member, to allow the pruning knife to go very far in deed. But how far this could be done we cannot safely say at present. But after the

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

[22nd March 1921]

assurance given us by the Hon'ble the Minister for Excise I think we should be satisfied with reiterating our wish that there should be retrenchment and that retrenchment should be introduced into every detail. After this, Sir, I think the resolution may be withdrawn."

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"I withdraw the resolution, Sir."

The motion was then by leave withdrawn.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, the resolution standing in my name is also a general resolution. I beg to move it because I think that the Government will be very willing to accept the resolution. After the discussion that has taken place they will understand in what heads reduction might be made. Therefore I think they will be willing to put into execution the idea embodied in the resolution. They will easily be able to reduce the amount. So I beg to move—

'19. *That the provision of Rs. 31,58,000 under 6-A. Portion of the combined Salt and Excise establishment debitable to 6. Excise be reduced by Rs. 1,50,000 (Budget, page 44)''.*

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"Whether we can make this reduction or not seems to depend on whether we should be impatient idealists and dash in at once and attempt to stop the consumption of liquor. If that is what we are to do, I am afraid that what we shall require is, as my Honourable Colleague has said, not a reduction but an increase. If we carry on a gradual reduction, we may be able also to reduce the staff. I do not see, however, how we can cut off such a large sum as one and a half lakhs, especially when we have the scheme for the revision of the staff before us. We are perfectly willing to try to make a reduction by a sum of half a lakh."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"Would not Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar agree to the reduction of half a lakh?"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I agree."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The motion is that the provision be reduced by half a lakh. Do Honourable Members agree?"

The motion as amended was carried unanimously.

The following motions were not made and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

12-45 p.m. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR—

20. *That the grant of Rs. 33,38,000 under 6. Excise be reduced by Rs. 1,50,000.*

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR—

21. *That the grant of Rs. 31,12,193 under 6-A. Excise—Salaries—Establishment, etc., be reduced by a sum of Rs. 1,00,000.*

Demand II, as altered, was then put to the Council and was granted *nem con.*

DEMAND III—STAMPS.

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Mr. President, I beg to ask for the vote of the House in respect of the demand for Rs. 3,68,336 plus another demand for Rs. 2,42,000. I have no remarks to offer in respect of these two grants, as the details on which both the items are proposed to be spent have been mentioned in the budget now in the hands of the Honourable Members."

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—" I beg to move—

' That in 7-A (a) Stamps—Non-Judicial Rs. 423, personal allowance, be deleted (Budget page 49). '

" I want to know for what purpose the personal allowance is provided."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" I am able to assure the Honourable Member that this allowance is also for the purpose of providing personal allowances to those subordinates who, on account of the recent reorganization, will suffer in salaries. It is not going to be a permanent personal allowance, but will disappear the moment each one of them rises to his respective grade."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—" Then I withdraw."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" I will put to the House the demand as made by the Hon'ble Mr. Habib-ul-lah."

Demand III was then put to the Council and was granted *nem. con.*

DEMAND IV—FORESTS.

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I have the honour to move for a grant of Rs. 51.11 lakhs for the Forest Department. The other day, Sir, when we were dealing with the general discussion of the budget I indicated, as far as I was able, the great need there is for development in the Forest Department and underlined the fact that this is the reason why this year the expenditure is advancing without a corresponding advance on the receipt side. It is necessary to develop the capital assets of the department; and an immediate return cannot reasonably be expected. Amongst a series of 19 or 20 resolutions for reduction of the Forest grant tabled on the agenda paper today, several relate to the Russellkonda saw-mill scheme. I shall deal with that scheme when we come to that particular item, but I should like now in introducing the grant to say generally that this is a typical illustration of expenditure on capital purposes which is necessary for the proper development of our forest assets; those assets would not be marketable unless transmuted into sawn timber."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" There are five motions tabled with regard to the Russellkonda saw-mill scheme."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

1. *That the lump provision of Rs. 2,16,000 made for the Russellkonda saw-mill scheme in Detailed Account No. 8-A. Forest—Conservancy and Works at page 51 be reduced by Rs. 1 lakh.*

Sriman BISWANATH DAS :—

2. *That the demand of Rs. 2,16,000, lump provision on account of the Russellkonda saw-mill scheme provided under 'Conservancy and Works' in Detailed Account No. 8-A. Forest, item 1, be omitted (Budget page 51).*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

3. *That the lump sum provision of Rs. 2,16,000 on account of the Russellkonda saw-mill scheme in 8-A. Forest and Works be omitted (Budget page 51).*

Mr. M. D. DEVADOSS :—

4. *That the lump provision on account of the Russellkonda saw-mill scheme Rs. 2,16,000 under 8-A. Forest—Conservancy and Works be reduced by 1 lakh (Budget page 51).*

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

[22nd March 1921]

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—

5. (i) *That the lump provision of Rs. 2,16,000 on account of the Russellkonda saw-mill scheme under 8-A Forest—Conservancy and Works be omitted (Budget page 51).*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ In view of the motion that the Member for Ganjam is going to move, I do not make my motion.”

The motion not having been made was deemed to have been withdrawn.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS :—“ I rise to move the motion that stands in my name. My reason for moving it is that the Forest Department itself is very expensive as can be seen from the memorandum that was given to us along with the budget estimate which shows that the department wants about Rs. 55,88,000 for 1921-22, that is, about 93 per cent of the total receipts that are expected for the year under discussion. This, I submit, Sir, is not at all proportionate to the income that is expected. We are after all taking so much trouble to get only 7 per cent of the net income. Hence I would request the House not to vote for this allotment, as we cannot expect any large income. Secondly, the District Board of Ganjam was in correspondence with the Government of Madras, and promised to run the saw-mill on a business scale, and the District Board of Ganjam said that it hoped to have a good income out of it. Well, Sir, up to this time, we have no experience of any good income accruing from this department, and it is specially dangerous to allow this department to run the saw-mill on a business line. Therefore I would ask the House to leave the management of this saw-mill to the District Board of Ganjam as has been previously arranged in the year 1918. It is for this reason, Sir, that I move that the demand Rs. 2,16,000 be omitted.”

Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH :—“ The saw-mill is going to be established at Russellkonda. By the name, it is not to be confounded that Russellkonda is a forest. It is far away from the forest, and the timber is to be conveyed to Russellkonda. I do not see how it is convenient to have a saw-mill at Russellkonda and I do not see any justification for establishing a saw-mill under the management of the Forest Department. Exactly what should have been done is that this mill should be run by the Industries Department. If the Government want to make things that are marketable, as the Hon'ble the Home Member said, they could manufacture chairs, tables, etc., and sell them in the market. That would perhaps be more marketable. It is not given to the Forest Department to undertake such costly schemes.

“ Then, there was such a mill in Russellkonda in 1894-95 not run by the Government, but run by a private company. The company failed because things could not be sold. I do not know what prospects are held out to the Forest Department and who manages the thing. I understand that the management of the whole thing is being entrusted to an European company Messrs. Parry & Co. Of course I am subject to correction. They have already begun the work there, factories are being established. The first thing that is done is the construction of manager's quarters. So they have begun constructing quarters for Parry & Co. Beyond that nothing has been done; no machinery has been indented for.”

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON (*interrupting*) :—“ I should like to correct it; it is not the case that no machinery has been indented for.”

Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH (*continued*) :—“ No; I went purposely there to see the sawmill; there was nothing of the saw-mill; there were only quarters for the managers of Messrs. Parry & Co., under construction. The District Board of Ganjam offered itself to run the concern. I do not see any reason why their offer has not been accepted and why Messrs. Parry & Co. have been given this management. The

22nd March 1921]

[Sriman Sasibushana Rath]

first ground is that it is not a fit subject to be handled by the Forest Department. Then in order to make things marketable we are not going to manufacture furniture and sell them in the market, and Government is not a trading company. On these grounds this sum of 2·16 lakhs ought to be omitted."

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Mr. President, the question of the installation of Russellkonda saw-mill was taken up, if I remember right, in the year 1919-20. Just before that the District Board of Ganjam approached with a suggestion that they should be allowed to run the saw-mill. At the same time, negotiations went on between the Government and a private company (Parry & Co.). Some gentlemen in Ganjam wrote to me whether the Government was justified in giving it to a private company. Then I had correspondence with the Director of Industries who referred me to the Chief Forest Officer, Mr. Cox. Government have shown great anxiety to develop that portion of the district by way of communications, and the construction of a railway line was also projected, and the District Board of Ganjam was asked to give its opinion as to whether it was willing to undertake the construction of the railway line. Now we find for the first time in the budget a provision for 2·16 lakhs for the development of this scheme. I understand from this that the Government are to spend all the capital expenditure and the private company is to run it and have the profit, what portion I do not know. I think the Honourable Member for Forest will elucidate the Council on the terms of the agreement, etc. Now the question is this : whether the Forest Department is running the whole thing and encouraging the private company to find market for the scantlings, etc., or whether the company is to have a certain portion of the profits realized therefrom. If really it has to be run on a system of profits for a company, I have a serious objection for this. When the company is willing to work, why should it not have its own capital and install its machines and make its own profit, the Government collecting the seigniorage thereof? In those circumstances, the Forest Department will have the seigniorage for itself and the company will have the profits. Tenders can be called for from various persons on the terms on which they should run the machinery. On the other hand, if the whole capital expenditure is to be incurred by the Government, why should the Government make matters smooth to others and thus lose the benefit of the whole scheme? For these reasons, I beg to move this motion."

1 p.m.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I think it would be more convenient if we hear the Member on behalf of Government."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I think I should best begin by explaining that this grant, although entered as a lump provision, is not on the same footing as the lump provisions to which exception has been taken on many occasions in this House. It is a lump provision the details of which are all within my possession. It was not thought necessary to burden the budget with the particulars of the machinery which it is proposed to set up, but if any honourable gentleman would like to know exactly how this sum of Rs. 2·16 lakhs is arrived at, I shall be happy to give him the detailed list, now in my hand, of the actual items of machinery which have been indented for. Out of the total outlay of Rs. 2·46 lakhs, Rs. 30,000 is being spent in the current year, including freight and machinery to that value, which has already arrived or is on the way. Arrangements have been completed for the purchase of other machinery through the agency of the European firm mentioned, i.e., Messrs. Parry & Co. The sum of Rs. 2·16 lakhs which appears in the budget for next year represents the balance necessary to give complete effect to the scheme."

[The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1921]

"Now the Forest Department has been criticised on the ground that it trenches on the sphere of the Department of Industries. I venture to say, Sir, that the criticism is not just. It might be just, if the Forest Department were in the habit of dealing with industries such as the making of chairs or tables, but it is hardly just when the actual work is merely that of converting the rough felled logs in the forest into the readily marketable form of sawn scantlings, beams, planks and so forth. That operation is an operation which is recognized in other parts of India and I think elsewhere throughout the world as a legitimate function of a Forest Department. It is recognized in Burma, in Bombay and in the United Provinces. Now the putting up and working of saw-mills of a modern type is a very difficult undertaking indeed. One speaker has told us that a local venture in 1896 proved a conspicuous failure. But since then a great deal of water has flowed under the bridge and far more is known about the methods of conducting saw-mills than was known then. Messrs. Parry & Co., as a firm engaged in that business, have had practical experience of a saw-mill of their own on the West Coast at Kallai. Their principal employee, Mr. Brace Brookes, is by general consent, possessed of exceptional expert knowledge and practical experience in these matters. It was he who gave advice to the Forest Department in regard to the project of establishing a saw-mill at Russellkonda at the early stages in the proceedings. It is quite true that Russellkonda is at some distance from the Goomsur forests, but it is also true that this is the most convenient centre for a saw-mill in order to pass on the sawn scantlings to the railway. I hope that, with the co-operation of the District Board which has been approached in this respect, we may before long be able to connect Russellkonda by rail with the main line. We had an informal conference with the President of the Ganjam District Board on that subject two or three months ago. And he then held out strong hopes that it would be possible for the Board to raise the capital expenditure necessary for such a branch line. I do not know if he has since succeeded in putting that proposal on a practical footing."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"It has now been abandoned, Sir."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I am very sorry to hear it. There was, as I said a prospect of the saw-mill being connected with the railway, but I am afraid the prospect is now more gloomy. Then, Sir, the Government of Madras consulted Messrs. Parry & Co., and their officer, Mr. Brace Brookes. Neither the firm nor Mr. Brace Brookes was under any obligation to help Government, but they were kind enough to do so. The next step of Government was to consult Sir George Hart, the Inspector-General of Forests. I should like to say at once that the action taken in regard to this scheme has been taken entirely on the advice of Sir George Hart and with the approval of the Government of India. Not only has he advised us in this matter but he also paid a special visit to consult trade interests in Calcutta, and to ascertain whether there was any objection on the score of competition by the Forest Department with private interests in the timber trade. Now, anybody who has had to deal with the details of large commercial undertakings will, I think, bear me out when I say that for a Government department to initiate and carry on such an undertaking is an exceedingly difficult matter owing to the trammels laid on Government officers by the Civil Service Regulations and the Civil Account Code and to the necessity of satisfying the Accountant-General at every turn. For that reason it was thought preferable that the practical working of this enterprise should be placed in the hands of persons accustomed to commercial practice and sufficiently in touch with the commercial world to be able to facilitate the marketing of timber when it leaves the mill. That was very

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

largely the reason why the assistance of Messrs. Parry & Co. was invoked as agents on behalf of the Government. The contract was completed with them last year—several months ago—after protracted discussion. The main terms I will now mention, premising that, as already stated, Messrs. Parry & Co. have practical experience in this matter, having set up and worked a saw-mill of their own, which has been highly successful, at Kallai on the West Coast. It was agreed that the mill should be set up at Government expense by Messrs. Parry & Co., in return for a payment of commission of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the total cost, that it should be worked by Messrs. Parry & Co. under the supervision and control of a Board of Control presided over by the Chief Conservator of Forests and with a majority of Government members on the Board, that the prices of timber sold should be fixed by the Board of Control and that Messrs. Parry & Co.'s remuneration for working the mills should consist of 5 per cent of the sale prices. I cannot say what income is likely to accrue to the firm in respect of that 5 per cent commission, because it is impossible at present to say exactly how much timber will be turned out or what the sale price of that timber will be. The sale prices of timber vary from day to day, but Mr. Cox, the Chief Conservator of Forests, estimates roughly that the annual profit earned by Messrs. Parry & Co. under this head will not exceed Rs. 15,000. He thinks that the profits that will accrue to the Government may rise to a higher figure, at least 30 per cent on the capital outlay of Rs. $2\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs, or about Rs. 75,000 per annum. I am afraid, Sir, I have only half a minute more time and I should like to devote it to the suggestion that the District Board should carry on this enterprise instead of Messrs. Parry & Co. as agents of the Forest Department.

"Mr. Biswanath Das, I think, said that this proposal had been previously under correspondence. The note that has been placed in my hands on the subject shows that in 1917 the Ganjam District Board applied for the sanction of the Government to construct a saw-mill at Russelkonda at a cost of Rs. 18,000 for sawing timber for 'use in the construction of schools, rest-houses and other works.' I venture to think, Sir, that this is not very different from embarking on a general policy of municipal trading and that it would not be acting in accordance with the spirit of the Local Boards Act, to have allowed the District Board of Ganjam to run a mill for the marketing of the produce of Government forests to all and sundry. The Public Works Department was in fact consulted on the matter and advised that the Board's scheme to set up a saw-mill for Rs. 18,000 should be deferred until after the war. The President agreed and the papers were recorded. That is the history of the efforts of the Ganjam District Board in 1917-18. I find that the subject was again discussed shortly after the close of the war, when the District Forest Officer of Ganjam happened to be at Ootacamund on leave, and my predecessor, Mr. Gillman—very naturally—decided that it was preferable for the Forest Department to erect and manage its own saw-mill rather than to employ the District Board as an agency for the exploitation of State forests. That, Sir, is briefly the position with regard to this item. I should like once more to emphasize that it relates to the execution of a contract with a firm and that if the conditions of the contract are not given effect to, the agent with whom the agreement has been made would have a right to proceed against the Government in case of non-compliance."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Mr. P. Siva Rao notified a motion in regard to this matter."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I should like to say, Sir, that I did not receive notice of Mr. Siva Rao's motion until I came to this hall to-day."

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

[22nd March 1921]

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“ I wish to say a few words about this matter which is also covered by resolution No. 3. When I came to this hall I was very anxious to hear what the Honourable Member in charge had to say in justification of this claim which involves a cost of 2·16 lakhs of rupees. After carefully listening to the member in charge, Sir, I must emphatically say that it is an unnecessary expenditure for this reason. If the Government had decided to work it themselves and to exploit the said project for their own benefit and in their own interest, I would have most unhesitatingly given my assent to it. I just learnt before the discussion that the District Board of Ganjam applied for permission to use the saw-mills and work them on certain conditions but that the Government declined to grant that concession. The justification of the Honourable Member in charge is that trading activities do not come within the purview of the local bodies. Leaving that question aside for a moment, I ask why should we have an intermediate agency like Messrs. Parry & Co? Have we made out that it is impossible to

work this concern without recourse to the help of this commercial firm and has it been necessary to pay such a large commission of 5 per cent? In addition to that 5 per cent they are to have $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the total expenditure. I would ask if there is any justification for this policy of entrusting the whole matter to a private company, and at a rate which would bring a handsome profit to the Government if the whole matter were in the hands of the State. The Honourable Member in charge asked whether it was not too much to expect Government to run a business of this kind. Have not Governments undertaken such functions? There is the sandalwood factory managed by the Forest Department in the Mysore State. It is the present policy of the Forest Department also. They have got their own Forest Utilization Officer. It is quite practicable, and it is very desirable that the State should manage these concerns themselves by way of demonstration of industrial enterprises. And whatever profit is got out of these ventures, the Government should be solely entitled to it. No doubt, it is said that a contract has already been executed and that in the event of our not confirming the same or continuing the same we are threatened with a suit.”

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVILSON (*interrupting*) :—“ There is no threat, Sir; but I may say, there is a legal liability.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO (*continuing*) :—“ There is very little difference between the two. I would rather await a suit, provided we could only uphold a principle. There is no justification whatever why a private company should be resorted to in the way the Government have done.”

“ Then, as for advice, I think we have got a special officer for forest utilization, and probably he might be trusted to give advice. Or, we might appoint some expert specially for a time who might be paid a special remuneration, and on the whole that would have been more desirable.”

Mr. M. D. DEVADASS :—“ In view of what the Honourable Member in charge has stated that the machinery has already been indented for, I do not think I should press this resolution. The liability has already been incurred. I do not think we shall be justified in pressing for the deletion of this item. I therefore withdraw my resolution (motion 4).”

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ The question of the development of the Ganjam forests was very carefully considered by two responsible officers for whom I had great regard and respect. Mr. Minchin, District Forest Officer, who had a detailed knowledge of the Ganjam forests has for a very long time, been considering how to utilize the resources of the Ganjam forests. In fact, we discussed the matter informally more than once how best we could utilize the large

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

forest wealth in the Ganjām and Goomsur forests. The Goomsur forests supply timber to the Vizagapatam and Gōdavari districts. It was also contemplated to start a paper-pulp industry out of the very suitable material that is available in the Ganjām forests. These two points were discussed, and we came to the conclusion that expert advice should be taken, and as a matter of fact, certain kinds of wood were sent to England by private agency to find out whether out of them paper pulp could be manufactured. Therefore, I submit that the question of the development of Ganjām forests has been engaging the attention of the local authorities and the non-official bodies, who were prepared to give full co-operation and support to it. This was of an informal nature, and before we approached the Government with any proper scheme we wanted to satisfy ourselves that we were on a stable ground.

“With regard to this timber question, several companies have been working in Goomsur and Ranaba forests as early as 1900. Messrs. Cass Company, which had its headquarters at Secunderabad, had a branch office at Berhampur and one in Goomsur forest for about eight years. The Cass Company contracted with many railway companies, both metre and broad gauge, supplying sleepers at a very great profit. Then, after the Cass Company left the place, the Madras Timber Company was floated in Madras for which Messrs. Parry & Co. were the Managing Agents. Messrs. Parry & Co., as Managing Agents, worked for three years in Goomsur and Surda forests and entered into a contract with zamindars in order that the timber available in those forests might be utilized for the manufacture of sleepers. During these three years there was another company worked by Mr. Varadakameswara Nayudu who was working before Messrs. Parry & Co. entered into contracts with the zamindars and the Government. Mr. Varadakameswara Nayudu set up a saw-mill and worked successfully for a time. I was myself concerned with both these firms.

“The Madras Timber Company could not beat all contractors ultimately. Afterwards, Mr. Varadakameswara Nayudu was taken as one of the chief agents and the two concerns had been amalgamated. Then a third rival came up from Surda, a Muhammadan named Muhammad Usman, for the manufacture of sleepers. He successfully competed with these people and ultimately he collapsed. This went on for about six months, and ultimately that poor man was obliged to raise a loan from Mr. Varadakameswara Nayudu and Messrs. Parry & Co., the Managing Agents. He was thus swallowed up by the Company. It was of course, business-like, and I do not quarrel with the method of work. Ultimately, the Timber Company itself had to be wound up, because the management of Messrs. Parry & Co. was very expensive, and the Madras Timber Company and Messrs. Cassim & Parry & Co. had to settle accounts and dissolve.

“Thus, you will see that this attempt by Messrs. Parry & Co. is not its first to work through agents, and those agencies have proved financial failures.

“I am sure that if an enthusiastic officer like Mr. Minchin, were asked to manage the forests, there would be no need to hand over the work to Messrs. Parry & Co. I enter my protest against handing over the management to Messrs. Parry & Co. I do so with all responsibility, because I know the kind of work the former company was doing and I know that wasteful expenditure and extravagance brought the company to ruin. It may be that the Government officers may supervise the work of the company but this supervision will be of no avail in the matter of economy if the work is managed by the company.

“I am not one of those who think that the Industries Department ought to take up the forest industries. The two must be separate. The forest industries must be developed independently by the Forest Department and not by the

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[22nd March 1921]

Industries Department, because they require special technical skill to deal with matters which are concerned with forest industries.

"Now, I would ask what steps the Government have taken in order to see to the working of the forest industries. Have any advertisements been made? Or, have any tenders been called for from public bodies and from other companies? I am sure there are several experienced persons who have been working in timber for twenty and twenty-five years who would be willing to take it up, and they, under the supervision of Government, may work it more successfully as they have done their own concerns in the matter of this timber business. Timber has to be taken from the interior of forests, labour has to be employed there, and then it has to be sized, cut into pieces, before it is brought to the saw-mill, and after this, it has to be manufactured into sleepers for commercial purposes. The huge timber that we get from the forest must be made commercially valuable. Before it passes through all these processes, it is impossible to say what the managing agents from Madras will be able to do it."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON (*interrupting*):—"May I ask, Sir, what relevance the getting of timber, etc., has to do with the allotment for the establishment and the utilization of the saw-mill? All those processes are being done and will continue to be done by the Forest Department and not by others."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO (*continuing*):—"It is relevant, Sir, if we should decide whether it is to be done by other agencies or by the department. The cost of transport is a necessary and relevant fact."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON (*interrupting*):—"I don't think the Honourable Member has understood me correctly. This grant has nothing whatever to do with the transport of timber from the forest to the mill."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO (*continuing*):—"This expenditure from the tax-payers' money is to make an investment in order that a private firm which had worked unsuccessfully on similar concerns may work successfully under the supervision of Government agency. I leave it, Sir, to the House to consider whether, in the circumstances, this House will vote for a sum in order that it may be worked by a private agency. I am constrained, therefore, to oppose the grant."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I wish, Sir, to get information on certain points which I believe will be of assistance to the members in voting one way or the other in respect of this

1-30 p.m.
motion. The Hon'ble the Home Member asked my friend Mr. Patro how the question of transport of timber from the Goomsur forest to Russellkonda, where this saw-mill is proposed to be located, is relevant for the purpose of this grant of two lakhs and odd. That is one of the points on which I want information from the Hon'ble the Home Member and its relevancy is this. The question, Sir, now before the House is whether the House should vote for this sum of two lakhs and odd. If it is good for the department, if it is good for the Government, and if it is profitable for the people that this mill should be established in Russellkonda, certainly it is desirable that this amount should be voted for. If, on the other hand, these advantages do not accrue, it is not desirable that this sum should be voted for. The success or otherwise of this mill will necessarily depend upon the cost which will have to be incurred in the transport of timber as well as on several other things. Some of the points on which I want information which will enable the members of this House to vote properly on this question are these. It has been stated both by the Member from Ganjam and by the Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson that Russellkonda is not in Goomsur. Some of the members in this House do not know

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

what the exact distance from the Goomsur forests to this Russellkonda is. I wish to have that information, though not accurate information, at least approximate information. That is one point on which I want information.

"Another point is this. Has any investigation been made as to the quantity of timber that is available in the Goomsur forests for feeding this saw-mill? What is the total quantity in cubic feet that is available to be felled in the Goomsur forests and that can be transported to this mill? I want that information for the purpose of knowing whether commercially this will prove a profitable transaction to the Government and to the country.

"Then, again, in the memorandum of the Hon'ble the Finance Member it is stated: 'Of late years a vigorous policy of exploitation has been pursued and this has involved the construction of roads and buildings, later of tramways, and last of all of a saw-mill. As a result, the expenditure on works, which was 13·82 lakhs in 1913-14, is expected to be 25 lakhs in 1921-22. The important new schemes provided for under this item are the addition of two new Conservators' circles, the erection of a saw-mill at Russellkonda'. . . . I wish to know, Sir, whether the tram line referred to in this memorandum is a tram line contemplated for the transport of timber from Goomsur forest to this Russellkonda.

"Then, Sir, we have been told that the District Board was asked to construct a railway for the purpose of transport of this timber and my friend Mr. Patro was good enough to tell us that the idea has been abandoned for the present. If that idea has been abandoned, I wish to know in what other ways it is proposed to transport timber, whether it is proposed to bring timber in carts, or whether there are rivers from the Goomsur forest to Russellkonda, and whether it is possible to float down timber from the hills to this place, whether it is possible to cart down timber logs from the forest to the saw-mill, or whether it is necessary to saw them at the place where they are felled before they are transported to this saw-mill.

"What are the duties of this Forest Utilization Officer? They become relevant in connexion with the entrusting of this concern to Messrs. Parry & Co. The Forest Utilization Officer is paid a sum of Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 1,250. In what way are his services utilized?"

Mr. K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—"Sir, I heartily support this motion. I support it not on the ground that Messrs. Parry & Co. are either efficient or inefficient to conduct this business on behalf of the Government, nor on the ground that the Government should not undertake such a speculative business at the time when it is far more difficult to make both ends meet, but on the ground of economy which has been the hobby of this House even at the outset at the time when it went through the general discussion on the budget. It is on that ground, that is, of economy, that I support this motion. We have heard from the explanation of the Home Member that in the interest of good administration of this enterprise they have entrusted this matter to Messrs. Parry & Co. It may be well and good. It may be that Messrs. Parry & Co. are quite efficient to carry on this business, but we have also heard from some of the local members that even some local gentlemen who have had considerable experience in timber business have not been encouraged in this business enterprise. This House has been in the dark as to what particular heads to take in order to economise expenditure, and we have seen, Sir, that we are not able to find any particularly big head of expenditure in order to be utilized for the salaries of the ill-paid non-gazetted officers. If this House is prepared to lay its hands on any decent head of expenditure, it is only this head in my humble opinion which would go to meet the needs of the non-gazetted officers on whose fates I have had the honour to

[Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya]

[22nd March 1921]

preside as a member of the Salaries Committee. Yesterday we passed items of expenditure to the extent of several lakhs. In the midst of the greatest struggle we have had the whole of yesterday. We have not been able to save, or rather to cut down, any item of expenditure, any decent figure which would go to strengthen the resources of these non-gazetted officers for meeting their expenditure. I would advise, Sir, at this moment that the House should not be prepared to vote a grant of this nature at a time when, as I have already remarked, the Government is not able to make both ends meet. We know, Sir, that several other matters are pressing upon the consideration of this House which would require a lot of saving in order to meet the expenditure on those heads; I do not quarrel with the explanation of the Home Member regarding the efficiency of Messrs. Parry & Co., or with the enterprise which the Government is going to undertake in order to make the timber from the Russellkonda forest more marketable. I only quarrel, Sir, with the Home Member on this ground of economy, and I beg to support this motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, Mr. Gopalakrishnayya has supported the motion before the House on the ground of economy. But I am certain that so far as this motion is concerned, far graver issues arise and this House cannot have any the slightest hesitation in accepting the motion for omission of this item. The House is much obliged to the honourable members for Ganjam for the valuable information they have placed at its disposal in dealing with this question. They have shown how previous attempts were made and how those attempts also ended in failure. It is with such information before us, that we have to come to a decision on this important question. I am constrained, Sir, to enter my protest against the principle of allowing such a lump provision being entered in this budget. A look at the budget estimate for 1920-21, will show that a sum of Rs. 1,60,000 was provided as a lump provision in 1920-21, and that for the next year we have again made a lump provision of Rs. 2,16,000. The Hon'ble the Home Member has told us that a sum of Rs. 30,000 has already been spent on that scheme. I do not know when it was spent, and I do not find any reference to it in the revised estimate. It again reminds us, Sir, of the danger and inconvenience we are put to in entering lump provisions in the budget, especially when no expenditure has been shown in the course of the year. An agreement has already been entered into and we are now called upon to vote for a sum of Rs. 2,16,000. It is, therefore, necessary that such lump provisions should be rejected in all possible cases unless when absolutely necessary. That is one chief objection which I wish to raise. The information which has been placed before us by Mr. Patro as to the further expenditure which is likely to be involved must give us caution in this respect. It is true that the provision that we are now called upon to vote is only Rs. 2,16,000, but it will be the beginning of a larger scheme of expenditure yet before us. We have not now before us any clear idea as to what extent we should be prepared to vote hereafter, in sanctioning this expenditure of Rs. 2,16,000. Can we consider this aspect irrelevant? Can we shut our eyes to the large expenditure which is before us? Therefore let the House remember that by sanctioning the expenditure of this Rs. 2,16,000, the House would practically be committing itself to a much larger expenditure. We have been told, Sir, that an agreement has already been entered into with Messrs. Parry & Co. It is very unfortunate that in large schemes of development there has not been any opportunity given to the public before agreements were actually entered into. According to ordinary rules, there should have been invitation of tenders before agreements were entered into with firms, however respectable they may be. We are all anxious to have larger schemes

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

of industrial development, larger schemes for the development of Indian industries. Indian firms should always be given opportunities to come forward. You have to invite tenders first and if tenders from no such companies be forthcoming, then by all means you may give such work to any one you please. But without calling for any tender, to enter into an agreement without the knowledge of the public and then to say that a contract has already been entered into is very unreasonable. I would join with Mr. Patro in thinking that even if this House should run the risk of any contemplated suit by Messrs. Parry & Co., we can very well undertake the risk."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" I rise to oppose the motion for retrenchment. There seems to be a strong feeling against placing the agency with Messrs. Parry & Co. for conducting the saw-mill at Russellkonda. The members should dissociate the agency contract from the mill as such.

"The provision for a saw-mill at present is quite opportune. The Railway Administrations in South India require five lakhs of sleepers and, for want of facilities for transport of timber from our forests and their conversion into sleepers, the foreign markets are taking up the work of supplies. The establishment of a saw-mill for which provision is made will serve to meet a great want and help to develop our resources.

"Government have always been attacked that they do not take any initiative in industries and when such an attempt is made as now to withhold grant is, I consider, a suicidal policy on the part of members. I therefore urge on the members to dissociate the question of the agency contract with Messrs. Parry & Co. from the erection of the saw-mill and vote for the grant."

Mr. J. F. SIMPSON :—" Mr. President, I wish to associate myself fully with what has fallen from the previous speaker. I am strongly opposed to making any reduction on this demand. I think the Government have undertaken this scheme with a view to the development of forest industries. Some members seemed to take exception to this and in a way the Government have got above them. In my opinion the Government was well advised to begin an enterprise in the shape of a saw-mill.

"Messrs. Parry & Co. is one of the oldest concerns in this Presidency, the pioneers in many departments of industry. They know their business and know it very well and Government was well advised in going to Messrs. Parry & Co. and asking them expert advice for the establishment of the saw-mill. The Hon'ble the Home Member has told us that the Government paid the amount to Messrs. Parry & Co. for the building of the saw-mill."

1-45 p.m.

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Not for the building, Sir, but for the installation of the machinery."

Mr. J. F. SIMPSON :—" I beg the Honourable Member's pardon, Sir. It is for the supply of machinery and the erection of the same. The commission of five per cent and the total sum of Rs. 15,000 to Messrs. Parry & Co. is by no means excessive and exception cannot be taken to that. Over and above all this is the development of the industries. The machinery has been ordered for and is on the way. It would be setting the hands of the clock back if this House should seek to cut down this demand. I earnestly trust that the House will carefully look into the matter and refuse to cut down this demand."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON :—" Mr. President, Sir, in February last when I supported the proposition to increase the pay of the non-gazetted officers, Mr. Todhunter said that I was trying to rob Peter to pay Paul. I now see an instance

[Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon]

[22nd March 1921]

where poor Peters have actually been robbed to pay rich Pauls. The point at issue is not whether or not the industrial concerns in forests are to be developed. The point for the consideration of this House is whether the contract has been entered into with Messrs. Parry & Co., and whether the demand for the ratification of the contract are acceptable to this House. During the short discussion we have had, certain important points have come to our notice. Messrs. Parry & Co. are to get all the logs of timber in the forests felled down and brought down to the place where the saw-mill is installed."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"No, Sir. It is a perversion of facts."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I think it would be well if the Hon'ble the Home Member explained the situation."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The facts of the case are that Messrs. Parry & Co. are concerned with the saw-mill only in the process of working it. They have nothing to do with the cutting of the timber in the forest or the transporting of it to the mill."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON :—"I was saying exactly the same thing, viz., that Messrs. Parry & Co's. business begins from the time when the timber is carried to the place where the saw-mill is installed. They are to get about two and a half per cent or so, on the money spent by us for supervision, and what they give in return is five per cent on the sale proceeds. This procedure would have been perfectly right and the grant given would have been quite acceptable if Government had taken pains to publish their requirements and seen whether there were not people who were prepared to accept the contract at a lower price. The instance of Kallai was brought to our notice. There, Messrs. Parry & Co. did not get their saw-mill or get it installed at the cost of Government. Then we know that in Cochin when the forest was opened, Messrs. Parry & Co. alone did not go to the Government to establish a saw-mill. There were Indian firms who were prepared to, and did, open saw-mills to turn out the timber there in the Cochin forests, into saleable items. So the analogy of Kallai does not hold good. The question is whether Government are right in giving the contract to Messrs. Parry & Co., when tenders have not been called for and publicity has not been given, to see whether or not there were people who would be coming forward to accept it at a lower rate. It is said that there are people, Indian gentlemen who are prepared to take up this business. We heard it said that the District Board of Ganjam was also prepared to take up this concern. Why is it then that it was given to Messrs. Parry & Co.? So long as we think that Indian industries have to be developed and Indians ought to be given an impetus to work the industries themselves, are we prepared to sit quiet when such things are thrown open to foreign firms at a time when Indian firms have not been consulted and when Indian gentlemen have not even been asked if they are prepared to take up business?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I was doubtful as to whether I should vote for this motion or not, after hearing that a sum of Rs. 35,000 had been spent already in this matter and that the Government had put their legs into this mire. But after hearing the various speeches, I am constrained to say I should vote for this motion for various reasons. First of all we were not told as to why this sum of thirty thousand should have been spent in advance, when the Council was to meet and when vote was to be taken. If we pass this now simply because the Government have already spent a large sum, we will be doing something like a farce and every year Government will spend money in advance and then say, 'we have spent it and therefore give your vote'. On that chief ground and on the

22nd March 1921] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

question of principle, etc., I have to vote for the motion. The next point is whether the Government are right in giving this commission agency to Messrs. Parry & Co. I am connected with some big firms who have got commission agencies of various kinds. One general condition is that they should not have anything to do with similar work anywhere else. Messrs. Parry & Co. may be perfectly honest. But I ask whether, after failing in their own concern and after trying to do several things there with the help of some others as the Hon'ble Mr. Patro said, it is fair for them to enter into this contract, when they own on their behalf a big saw-mill at Kallai. Supposing there is a question of big orders being given, I leave it to the Council to consider whether Messrs. Parry & Co. will prefer their own mill at Kallai or this mill at Russellkonda. Even though we run the risk of losing the Rs. 30,000 and also probably run the risk of litigation with Messrs. Parry & Co., I think, in order that such contracts will not be entered into by the Government with various firms in anticipation of sanction, I must support this motion."

Sriman BISVANATH DAS :—"I am very glad, Sir, that my motion has received right response of this House. The Hon'ble the Home Member while explaining, rather, justifying his position did not give us to know how the Government entered into a contract with Messrs. Parry & Co., when the District Board of Ganjam was in correspondence with the Government of Madras as late as October 1917. In October 1917, the District Board of Ganjam was given the assurance that it would be allowed to launch on this scheme, rather the management of the saw-mill. The District Board of Ganjam spent some money there, collected all the information at its resource and then approached the Government time after time with hopeful expectations. Suddenly, Sir, in the month of March it received a card just informing the district board to wait till the end of the war. That came in the month of March 1918. Sir, within these one and a half or two years, I do not know what has transpired to make the Government enter into contract with Messrs. Parry & Co., without the knowledge of the District Board of Ganjam or the business people who were interested in running this saw-mill. The Hon'ble the Home Member has informed us that Messrs. Parry & Co. will have a profit of Rs. 15,000. Well, Sir, if we expect a profit of Rs. 15,000 from the business, why not you allow the District Board of Ganjam to strengthen its resources so as to be more useful to the people of the district whose industrial possibility it will exploit? The Forest department, as I understand, has got some more staff—some forest engineers, some assistant and deputy assistant conservators this year. I think the Government would have done well, at least to justify its position, in launching on its own scheme as pointed out by one of my honourable friends. The last thing that I would appeal to the House is whether it is proper at this stage of our financial stringency to launch on a scheme of running a saw-mill without knowing what the future expenses would be, I take it, Sir, leading us to uncertain quarters. With these words I press the motion for a division."

Rao Sahib P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"Has the Government entered into any contract with this company for any definite period?"

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Yes, the contract is for a term of five years."

Rao Sahib P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"If Government can assure us that they can change this method of commission agency, I do not think the House will have any objection to vote for this provision."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"It is quite impossible for the Government to change the method of the agency. Surely Honourable Members accustomed to the law courts should be able to answer that question."

[The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1921]

"The first point I wish to take is that a great deal of criticism has been directed to this proposal for the establishment of a saw-mill on the ground that it has been sprung upon the Council, and nobody knew anything about it before. I should like to invite the Honourable Members' attention to the fact that in the budget estimate of 1920-21 a provision of Rs. 1,60,000 was made for this very purpose. The entry will be found at page 51 of the budget estimate side by side with the present lump provision of Rs. 2,16,000. It is not a new scheme. It had been under discussion for a long time and a provision of Rs. 1,60,000 was made in the current year's budget. It is out of this sum of Rs. 1,60,000, that a sum of Rs. 30,000 has been spent this year, a portion, possibly large, being devoted to the building of the premises in which the saw-mill will be installed. Indeed, but for unexpected delays, the machinery would have been paid for and installed before the close of this financial year. There is nothing whatsoever new about the scheme, and it has long been open to any gentleman who is interested in the matter to ask for particulars. Great stress has been laid by Mr. Patro on the number of local residents and merchants who possess experience of the timber trade. I should like to ask him if any one of these gentlemen has any practical knowledge of the highly technical industry which it is proposed to carry on in this Russellkonda saw-mill."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Yes, Sir."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I shall be obliged if the Honourable Member will give me the names of any persons who have practical knowledge of the modern saw-mill."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Mr. Varada Kameswara Rao Nayudu, proprietor of twenty villages, whose income is Rs. 20,000. He has set up a saw-mill himself."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I shall in due course, Sir, investigate the nature of that saw-mill and, for my own information, compare it with the saw-mill which we propose to instal at Russellkonda. I have very little doubt what the result of that investigation and that comparison will be. Sir George Hart advised us to employ Messrs. Parry & Co., and his selection was due to the fact that there was no other firm which had any real knowledge of technical saw-mill work. Messrs. Parry & Co. have gained some knowledge of it in their saw-mill at Kallai."

"Mr. Krishnan Nayar has asked me several questions. He asked me where Russellkonda is, how far it is from the agency forests. With your permission, Sir, I will pass over to him the map in my hand. It shows in green the reserved forests and just outside, close to them, lies Russellkonda, which is centrally situated and conveniently accessible from the forests. As to whether there is to be any connecting tramway I am not certain, but, if so, it will not be more than about half a mile in length. Mr. Krishnan Nayar asked me again what would be the amount of timber likely to be worked up in this mill. It is quite impossible to say exactly what amount. That depends upon the conditions prevailing in regard to

3 F M.

extraction from the forest. But I can give him a rough figure, namely, some 300,000 cubic feet a year. I stated before, when

I was first addressing the House that we were anticipating a profit of something like 30 per cent on the capital outlay, and I also referred to the 'profit' of Messrs. Parry & Co. I may now, in passing, say that their 'profit' is really a sum paid to them for lending the services of their experts in managing and working the saw-mill. It is not profit in the same sense as the profit accruing to Government. Also, as my honourable colleague reminds me (turning to Mr. Todhunter), it includes payment for their services as selling agents with the

22nd March 1921]

[The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

advantage of a large business connexion throughout the Presidency. I said that we ourselves might expect a return of something like 30 per cent, or possibly three-quarters of a lakh each year from our dealings with this mill. And that induces me to turn round in the direction of the honourable gentleman who said that he supported this resolution on grounds of economy. What sort of economy is it, Sir, to cut out an expenditure of Rs. 2,16,000, if that economy results in the loss of a recurring profit of three-quarters of a lakh?"

Sriman BISVANATH DAS:—"Is that the probable income, Sir? That is the estimated income."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"That is the estimated net income, Sir. It is the estimate of our chief adviser. It is quite impossible to be accurate in these matters, but it is reasonably certain that this saw-mill will yield a large profit. There is not the least doubt about that. Mr. Gopala Menon, in his anxiety to forward the claims of non-gazetted officers, is ready to raid any hen-roost and jumps at the opportunity of getting Rs. 2,16,000 from this innocent source? The same Honourable Member spoke of 'robbing Peter to pay Paul.' May I invoke another more apposite proverb and remind him of the wisdom of the person who killed the goose 'that laid the golden eggs.' Surely that is what his proposal suggests, for if this saw-mill does not come into existence, the non-gazetted officers of the future will have three-quarters of a lakh less each year to be utilized for their benefit.

"Then, Sir, I have been asked why the Forest Utilization Officer should not have been employed on this work. He has been employed on it, in so far as it is possible to employ his services with profit and advantage. He is actually building the premises; and is responsible for a good part of the expenditure of Rs. 30,000 that has been incurred this year. But he is entirely lacking in the special qualifications necessary for the installation of elaborate sawing machinery in the premises which he is building. Mr. Patro has referred in terms of high praise, which I would like cordially to endorse to the District Forest Officer of Ganjam. Does he realize that Mr. Minchin has been heart and soul with us in regard to the scheme?"

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO (*interrupting*):—"I do not agree with him there."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON (*continuing*):—"The Honourable Member differs from him. I think it is better to follow the advice of an experienced Forest Officer with his detailed local knowledge and the counsel given to us by the Chief Conservator of Forests and by the most experienced Forest Officer in all India, Sir George Hart. I should like once more to emphasise that the timber which is going to be sawn up in these mills is felled by local sawyers in the forest, brought by local carters to the mills and then only handed over to the firm, which runs the mill under the close supervision of a Board of Control presided over by the Chief Conservator of Forests with a Government majority. The Board of Control fixes the prices and has power to deal as it thinks fit, subject to the limitations laid down in the contract, with the operations of Messrs. Parry & Co. It has been insinuated that we invited Messrs. Parry & Co. out of a desire to benefit the European and that the racial taint of a bureaucratic Government is really at the bottom of this nefarious scheme."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO (*interrupting*):—"It was never insinuated anywhere."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON (*continuing*):—"Not by Mr. Patro perhaps; but in saying that it was so insinuated I am within the recollection of the House, Sir. Such an insinuation has distinctly been made in this House.

[The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson] [22nd March 1921]

Nothing was further from the thought of the Government than this. They looked round carefully to find men who knew something about this business and were likely to make a success of it; and the only practical proposition seemed to be the offer of Messrs. Parry & Co. who had conducted with success a somewhat similar saw-mill in Malabar. The Government consulted the Inspector-General of Forests and it was with his advice and with the approval of the Government of India that this scheme was elaborated. We are quite convinced that we are more likely to make a success of it with Messrs. Parry & Co. as agents than with any one else. And this I may say, that if the experience of their term of five years should prove that our anticipation is not realized then, we shall be perfectly ready to replace Messrs. Parry & Co. by any one likely to do better. I do implore this House to set aside altogether the question of race in this connexion. It is a business proposition. The Government have done their best to initiate a new departure under the conditions most favourable to success and the fact that they have employed a European firm should not in any way be allowed to militate against the conduct of the venture. This scheme, Sir, as I have said before and as I should like once more to repeat, is not a new scheme. It was put forward last year. The proper time for attack was last year and no such attack was then made."

The motion was put to the vote and a poll taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 22. Mr. M. Suryanarayana. |
| 2. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 23. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 3. Mr. P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 24. Mr. Sadasiva Bhat. |
| 4. Mr. K. Gopalakrishna Mayya. | 25. Sriman Sasibhushana Rath. |
| 5. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menou. | 26. Mr. D. Seshagiri Rao. |
| 6. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 27. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 7. Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. | 28. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 8. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 29. Mr. T. G. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 9. Mr. A. P. Patro. | 30. Sriman Bisvanath Das. |
| 10. Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar. | 31. Mr. T. M. Narasimhachari. |
| 11. Mr. A. Ramayya Punja. | 32. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 12. Mr. K. Saratha Reddiyar. | 33. Mr. U. Rama Rao. |
| 13. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai. | 34. Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao. |
| 14. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayakar. | 35. Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 15. Mr. C. Venkataranga Reddi. | 36. Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 16. Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 37. Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar. |
| 17. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 38. Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao. |
| 18. Mr. M. C. Raja. | 39. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 19. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. | 40. Mr. V. Appa Rao Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. P. Kesavalu Pillai. | 41. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 21. Mr. M. C. Madurai Pillai. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson. | 18. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 2. " Mr. C. G. Todhunter. | 19. Mr. M. D. Devadoss. |
| 3. " Md. Habib-ul-lah Sahib. | 20. Mr. E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 21. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 5. " Mr. A. Subbarayalu Reddiyar. | 22. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 6. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 23. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 7. " Mr. K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. | 24. Mr. J. F. Simpson. |
| 8. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 25. Mr. T. Namburumal Chettiyar. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 26. Mr. P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 10. Mr. R. G. Grieve. | 27. Md. Koya Sahib. |
| 11. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 28. Qadir Nawaz Khan Sahib. |
| 12. Mr. E. Periyannagam. | 29. A. P. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 13. Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 30. Md. Usman Sahib. |
| 14. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 31. Abd-ul-razzaq Sahib. |
| 15. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. | 32. Md. Abdur Rahaman Sahib. |
| 16. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. | 33. Munshi Md. Abdur-Rahman Sahib. |
| 17. Mr. K. Suryanarayana murti Nayudu. | 34. A. D. Bavotti Sahib. |

22nd March 1921]

[The Hon'ble the President]

The motion was declared carried 41 voting *for* and 34 *against* it.

The House adjourned for lunch at 2-15 p.m. and re-assembled at 3.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :— “ The Council will now resume consideration
3 p.m. of other items for grants under the head of ‘ Forests ’ on page
3 of the agenda.”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :— “ I rise to make the motion standing
in my name which runs as follows :—

8. *That in 8-A. Forest—Conservancy and Works Rs. 78,000 grain compensation allowance and local allowance for high prices, be deleted (Budget page 51).*

“ I think this House has expressed in no uncertain terms its opinion with regard to deletion of allowances. I know all about these grain compensation allowances, and local allowances for high prices, which is a thing of the past. Evidently here they are continuing it. The system of continuing this grain compensation allowance has been considered both at the time the proposals were made for revision of pay and when giving effect to them to be a wrong policy. It was on account of that the salaries of the officers have been revised. I do not see, therefore, any reason why this particular department should remain where it was (I take it that the old salaries continue and allowances are being paid). That in my opinion is a wrong policy and what ought to be done is that we should revise the salaries and allowances of the officers. It is in that sense I move this motion and trust that the Government ought from this point of view revise the salaries and duty allowances of officers.”

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :— “ I shall have no difficulty in satisfying the Honourable Member that he is on the wrong track and that he has been diverted, I think, by our old friend ‘ the printers’ devil ’. No bracket ought to connect ‘ (b) Grain compensation allowance ’ and ‘ (c) Local allowances for high prices. ’ The sum in issue really consists of the additional allowance given to temporary hands. I mean, additional allowance in the sense that, when it is found necessary to revise the scale of pay of the permanent establishment, it is equally necessary for obvious reasons to revise the scale of pay of the temporary hands. Most of these temporary hands are persons on very low pay and as a general rule they draw an additional 50 per cent as allowance. Not only is it a mistake of the printer’s devil, but some subordinates in the Chief Conservator’s Office, or in the Financial Secretariat have made a further mistake. The provision entered here is Rs. 78,000, but as a matter of fact it need only have been Rs. 41,000. That is due to the erroneous belief that the Conservators of one or two circles had omitted to provide for the cost of this temporary allowance. In the Government Order issued in August last which sanctioned these temporary allowances it was directed that all such items should be added to the pay of the posts and shown as a consolidated item under each of the heads I to IX. That is what the Rs. 41,000 represents here under head IX. It is the additions on account of increase of pay to something like 2,500 temporary hands, such as watchers, draughtsmen, maistris, blacksmiths, and so forth. Altogether the total amount is distributed throughout the Presidency among 2,526 temporary hands, the aggregate sum being only Rs. 41,000 for the reason that many of these temporary hands are only employed for short periods. The position, therefore, is that this figure represents additions to the pay of temporary hands following as a logical sequence the additions to the pay of permanent hands. I hope that in the light of this explanation the motion will not be pressed.”

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [22nd March 1921]

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I am told that in the case of temporary allowance it can be given even to temporary hands and therefore it was given. If it is really the contention that the pay is not sufficient, then a higher pay should be given as temporary pay, instead of allowance. It is the system which I object to. I can admit that the pay given in the old days was not sufficient. But what I object to is the system of calling it ‘ allowance ’ instead of calling it ‘ pay ’.”

The Hon’ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I dare say that point can be rectified if my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, agrees to it. It is purely a question of transfer from one head to another. I have not the slightest objection to any change in that respect if the Finance Department agrees to it.”

The Hon’ble the PRESIDENT :—“ Has the Finance Member anything to say ? ”

The Hon’ble Mr. C. G. TODEUNTER :—“ If it is going to be transferred to my department, I shall be very glad to look into the matter before I can say anything definite on the point.”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Then I do not press the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The Hon’ble the PRESIDENT :—“ Mr. Siva Rao will move motion Nos. 6 and 7.”

The Hon’ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ May I ask for a brief time ? My reason is that I first received intimation of these two items at 11 o’clock this morning when the supplement came in. My second reason is that the person, who is in charge of the department, the Chief Conservator of Forests has got to work out the details.”

The Hon’ble the PRESIDENT :—“ I think we can take them later.”

The motions were accordingly adjourned.

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ The motion which stands in my name runs as follows :—

9. *That the sum of Rs. 780, local allowance for the District Forest Officer, North Malabar, included in 8-B. Forest Establishment, be omitted (Budget page 52).*

“ Sir, I see no reason why this sum is granted as a local allowance to a particular District Forest Officer.”

The Hon’ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ This is an old story. Most of those who have been in Government service know why these allowances exist. They are special local allowances given in consideration of the unhealthiness and expensiveness of the locality in which the officers work. They are known as Wynad allowances and are given not only to the District Forest Officer but I think, also to almost every other officer of Government who is serving in the Wynad. It is a very feverish and unhealthy tract.”

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ I beg to withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following resolutions were then taken up together :—

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

10. *That the duty allowance of Rs. 2,400 for the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator at page 52 be omitted.*

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

11. *Delete Rs. 2,400, duty allowance for the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator (Budget page 52).*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

12. *That under 8-B. Forests, the duty allowance of Rs. 200 a month for the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator be omitted (Budget page 52).*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

13. *Omit duty allowance for the Personal Assistant to Chief Conservator Rs. 2,400.*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

14. *Omit duty allowance to the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator Rs. 2,400.*

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Sir, I have the old question of duty allowances again. I find that the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator is apparently an officer transferred from the Land Revenue Department, who gets a pay of Rs. 550. In addition to this, he gets a duty allowance of Rs. 200 which is more than one-third of his pay. I should like very much to know from the Hon'ble the Home Member what those dangerous duties are which this particular officer has to perform like those officers who are employed in the Settlement department.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, I have nothing more to add to what has already been stated.”

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“I have not been able to find any reason why the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator should have the right to draw duty allowance.”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I shall wait.”

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“As to the question of the dangerous or unhealthy nature of the duties of this officer I am not prepared to affirm anything; but those are not the only grounds on which special allowances are justified. I should like first to mention that, before the post of the Chief Conservator of Forests was created, the work now discharged by him has devolved on the Member of the Board of Revenue generally known as the Forest Member. He had as his assistants for this purpose not only the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, but also the Assistant Secretary. The present Secretary to this Council long held the latter post and can confirm me when I say that he drew a local allowance of Rs. 200 a month, that is, precisely the same allowance as has now been attached to the post of Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests.

“I should like next to mention what the duties of this Personal Assistant are and, if the President will permit me, I would propose, instead of speaking from memory, to read out a few lines from a note which I wrote on the subject when the post was about to be created.—

‘There remains the question of the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator, and this is a part of the scheme to which I attach the greatest importance. It has been recognized throughout the discussion in December and January that the Chief Conservator cannot carry on the routine of the Board's forest office as well as his professional duties together with the extended touring which this involves, unless he has a personal assistant of a calibre similar to that of an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary. It is contemplated that this assistant should

[The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson] [22nd March 1921]

exercise full control over the Chief Conservator's office, attend to the consolidation of general reports and submit directly to Government many references which are not of such importance or so technical in character as to require the previous scrutiny of the Chief Conservator himself, but nevertheless have to go up to Government. This is not work which could properly be entrusted to a clerk. The consensus of opinion was that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find an Imperial or Provincial Service Forest officer suitable for the post. The Secretariat aptitude and experience requisite are not ordinarily possessed by Forest officers and the department is so short-handed that it would be a mistake so to utilize any officer possessing technical forest qualifications.'

"I may here interject that it is in fact the practice in other provinces in India for the duties of personal assistant to be discharged by a senior gazetted Forest officer. Sir George Hart strongly advised that we should follow this practice in Madras. I will now return to the note from which I have been reading: it continues:—

'It was this aspect of the case that induced the Board to propose a wide field of selection covering the Provincial Civil Service, and the duty allowance of Rs. 200 per mensem was deliberately fixed on the basis of that drawn by the Assistant Secretary to the Board and the Provincial Under Secretary. It was desired to make provision for selection from other fields as well, but the idea certainly was that a good Deputy Collector would have to be chosen for the post. A local allowance of Rs. 200 per mensem should make it possible to get and retain the best man and I should be loathe to reduce this scale. It must be remembered that the incumbent will be much less under direct supervision than either an Under Secretary or the Board's Assistant Secretary. The post of forest assistant in the Board's office will of course be abolished.'

"As a matter of fact when the Chief Conservator is on a distant tour, this personal assistant of his, rules the entire department until he comes back and puts himself in touch with civilization. I think, Sir, that establishes the position that the duties discharged by this officer are both more arduous and more responsible than those ordinarily devolving upon Deputy Collectors serving in the regular line and the allowance is in accord with the general principle regulating duty allowances. It is therefore expedient that this officer should receive a duty allowance, and it cannot properly be less than the amount mentioned."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I oppose this motion. Though I am not in favour of duty allowance and local allowance, yet when so many officers, who are on special duty, are getting them, I do not see why this particular single officer should not get it. So, until we settle or the Government settles the cases of all the officials, this officer, I think, deserves to draw his allowance. So I oppose this motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"One word in reply, Sir. I agree with the Hon'ble the Home Member when he states that the Chief Conservator must have a personal assistant and that for various reasons it is desirable that that personal assistant should be one from the Revenue Department and that he should have the rank of a Deputy Collector or a similar status. I have no objection to that because I agree with the answer given that when the Conservator goes beyond the bounds of civilization, there must be some one who will attend to his current duties. Why should the additional amount given to him be called as duty allowance, why not fix it as the pay of the officer? To-day we have grown wiser than yesterday. Yesterday we were told by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

that the duty allowances are given for 'arduous and dangerous' duties which expose men to risks and even loss of life, and so on. So, the Hon'ble the Home Member practically contradicts his colleague and says—"

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I say, Sir, that I have not made any contradiction of my honourable colleague's statement. He cited one set of reasons from general definitions about the duty allowance and I have cited another set. Both are not mutually contradictory."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I regard this as a contradiction, Sir. But, however that may be, I have the very high authority of the Finance Department in support of my motion, because I understand that the very passage which the Hon'ble the Home Member has quoted was a reply to the objection raised by the Finance Department in regard to the same duty allowance though ultimately the Home Member has succeeded in getting the allowance sanctioned. So, I am glad that I have the highest authority of the Finance Department on my side. Though the amount concerned is small, I do not like to withdraw the motion and I press it."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" As a question has been raised as to why we should not add these allowances to pay, I feel I should repeat what I said yesterday. The reason is when once we have appointed a man on higher pay we cannot turn him out without reducing that pay. Under the system of duty allowances, we can appoint a Deputy Collector we might find suitable and give him Rs. 200 a month extra. It would come to Rs. 750 a month. Having made a selection, we cannot change it without prejudicing the officer in respect of his pay. I can assure the House that every allowance has to go through the Finance Department and will be scrutinized."

The motion was then put to the vote and declared lost, 12 voting for and 40 voting against it.

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar not being present, his motion on the same subject was deemed to have been withdrawn.

All the other motions on the same subject were then by leave withdrawn.

The Council then proceeded to discuss the following motions relating to Extra Assistant Conservators :—

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—

15. *Delete Rs. 3,000, duty allowance for five Extra Assistant Conservators in major charge districts (Budget page 52).*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

16. *Omit Rs. 3,000, duty allowance for Extra Assistant Conservators in major charge districts.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

17. *That under 8-B. Forests the duty allowance of Rs. 3,000 for Extra Assistant Conservators of Forests be omitted.*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

18. *Omit duty allowance for Extra Assistant Conservators in major charge districts Rs. 3,000.*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to move that the duty allowance of Rs. 3,000 for Extra Assistant Conservators in major charge districts be omitted. Honourable Members will find that the duty allowance for these officers is at the rate of Rs. 50 a month. Sir, with regard to this and other duty allowances in the budget estimate, I feel very strongly that some general

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

[22nd March 1921]

inquiry into the necessity for these allowances should be undertaken. It may be that the allowances were sanctioned at a time when they were necessary. I do not know whether the Finance Department goes into the question of allowances periodically or whether when, once fixed, they are there for all time to come. It seems to me that, in view of the revision of the salaries of the all-India services, the Provincial services and the subordinate services, it is necessary to find out whether these duty allowances are justified under present circumstances. Of course, as I have already stated, the first Salaries Committee recommended that some examination of this question should be undertaken to see whether any of these allowances could be merged in salaries wherever it is necessary and wherever the heads of departments can dispense with these allowances in the case of some of their officers. Therefore I am pressing this motion more with a view to draw attention to this matter and secure an examination of the whole question once for all not only with reference to this allowance, but with reference to all allowances. So long as the Government have not proposed to examine these allowances, we shall continue to press further deletion in this Council. That is why I am pressing this motion.

“As regards the exact grounds on which these five officers have been allotted these allowances it is more than likely that the Hon'ble the Home Member may be able to give us the reason that they are employed in districts where the cost of living is high or where any peculiar or particularly different circumstances exist. Anyhow it is quite a different matter. I am on the general question and therefore I propose that these allowances should be cut off.”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—“I also agree with my honourable friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao in what he said. I think an inquiry into these cases of duty allowances and other allowances is absolutely necessary. If the Hon'ble the Finance Member would give an assurance that all such questions will be submitted to the Finance Committee that is going to be appointed, personally I would not be disposed to press this matter. I have given notice of a number of motions in regard to duty and local allowances, etc. If I have an assurance that all allowances will be submitted to the Finance Committee there is no necessity for us to go into all these questions now. If he is not prepared to give that assurance I would press this.”

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—“I am afraid, Sir, I cannot give the assurance asked for. The nature of this allowance does not seem to be quite clearly comprehended. It is given to an extra assistant conservator when he is placed in charge of a major district. Forest districts have been divided for many years into major and minor charges, and the theory is that subject to certain exceptions, major charges are held by members of the higher services, the Indian Forest Service, and minor charges by the Provincial Forest Service. This theory is based on the proposition that major district is a more responsible and heavier charge; when, therefore, owing to lack of sufficient staff belonging to the higher service, it is necessary to put an officer of the inferior service in charge of a major district, it has long been accepted as the right policy to recognize the heavier nature of the charge by granting to him a special charge allowance of Rs. 50. Now, in early days in Madras—owing to an economy regrettable because invidious—the number of these charge allowances of Rs. 50 a month was arbitrarily limited to two. A similar limitation existed in Bombay and in other parts of India. When in 1911 the Government of India examined the entire organization of the Forest Service throughout India, this arbitrary limitation attracted their attention, and they laid down, with the approval and formal sanction

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

of the Secretary of State, that in future every extra assistant conservator temporarily placed in major charge should receive a charge allowance of Rs. 50 per mensem, but no officiating allowance should be given. That rule has been in force for ten years, and I am certainly not prepared to advise its abrogation on a vote in the course of this discussion. If it were so abrogated, the members of the Provincial Forest Service would have just grounds for discontent, and they would argue, Sir, that the recent revision of their pay had taken into account the fact of their eligibility for this charge allowance. If therefore the charge allowance were now deleted, it would be necessary further to consider how to compensate the service for that deletion by additions to the scale of ordinary pay.

"It may be asked whether these duty allowances have been scrutinized. I understand from my Hon'ble Colleague Mr. Todhunter, that after the Salaries Committee's report was received all the duty allowances referred to therein were subjected to scrutiny and that no duty allowances have been included in this budget which have not passed that scrutiny. I understand therefore, though I may be in error in that respect, that this particular duty allowance did come under consideration. Even if this be not the case, I am prepared to fall back on my second line of defence, and to say that it is a form of emolument specially sanctioned by the Government of India for the whole of India and should therefore certainly not be deleted or held in abeyance."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I have also to oppose this motion just on two grounds. The Hon'ble the Home Member stated the distinction between major and minor charges. If I am correct, I think there are 35 charges of which 25 are major of which 16 are held by Indians. Of these 11 are held by Indian Deputy Conservators who were till recently extra deputy conservators but were recently taken in the Imperial Service. Therefore there will be five extra assistant conservators in charge of major charges. My idea is this. It is a question of difference of pay between two persons who do the same work. If a European does the same work on a major charge he gets probably Rs. 1,600. I may tell here that a retired man has been called back and now holds a major charge on Rs. 1,600. But if an Indian held the same post and if he is only an extra assistant conservator, he is only to get Rs. 550. I have in view Coimbatore which is a major division, and also, I believe, West Vellore which is also a major division. Therefore the same work will be done by both under the same liability to be transferred from one major district to another major district, and it would be invidious to have much distinction between two officers, one because he is in the Imperial Service and the other in the Provincial Service. Therefore any attempt to reduce this difference should be encouraged, and this giving of Rs. 50 will reduce this difference a little. Otherwise the people who do the work of being in charge of major divisions will be obliged to draw only Rs. 550. I also understand that in the case of deputy assistant conservators, whose pay was only Rs. 1,300 and the duty allowance Rs. 250, the duty allowance has been merged in their pay, which has become Rs. 1,600, i.e., Rs. 1,350 plus Rs. 250. But in the case of the extra assistant conservators the pay has not been increased, and it is only by chance they hold these places. They cannot be given an increase of pay, but are only given an allowance. So it is but fair that when they hold major charges they should get something in addition to their usual pay, which they will not get in doing some other work or in charge of minor districts. Therefore I think we must not grudge to pay this fifty rupees. So I strongly oppose this resolution."

Mr. Ramachandra Rao and Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar withdrew their respective motions. Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju not having made his

[The Hon'ble the President]

[22nd March 1921]

motion, it was deemed to have been withdrawn. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar was absent and his motion was deemed to have been withdrawn.

The Council was then about to discuss the resolutions dealing with the provision for the formation of two additional circles.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"With regard to these motions I have just received His Excellency's order that the posts of two new Conservators of Forests have already been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, and the amount of the provision is therefore non-votable. The allotment of Rs. 80,000 includes the pay of the two appointments which His Excellency has ruled as non-votable, and also an amount for establishment and contingencies, and the latter portion is votable. I want to know whether under these circumstances Honourable Members would care to discuss the second portion of the grant."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I don't think it is worth while discussing it under those conditions. For if the superior officers are to go on, they must have some establishments."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I understand the House does not propose to deal with the votable matter in these motions, and they will therefore be struck out in their entirety."

The following motions were accordingly withdrawn from the agenda :—

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—

24. *Delete Rs. 80,000, lump provision for the formation of two additional circles.*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

25. *That the following item be omitted in 8-B. Forest—Establishments :—
Rupees 80,000, lump provision on account of the scheme for the formation of two additional circles (Budget page 52).*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

26. *That under 8-B. Forest—Salaries, the lump provision of Rs. 80,000 on account of the scheme for the formation of two additional circles be omitted (Budget page 52).*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

27. *That the demand for Rs. 80,000 being lump provision on account of the scheme for formation of two additional circles under detailed account No. 8-B. Forest—Establishment be reduced to Re. 1 (Budget page 52).*

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—

28. *That the lump provision of Rs. 80,000 made on account of the scheme for the formation of two additional circles under 8-B. Establishments may be omitted (Budget page 52).*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

29. *That under 8-B. Forests the lump provision on account of the scheme for the formation of two additional circles of Rs. 80,000 be omitted.*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I beg to move—

30. *That the lump provision of Rs. 30,000 on account of the payments of arrear salaries to the Imperial and Provincial Forest Service consequent on the revision of salaries be omitted (Budget page 52).*

22nd March 1921] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

"I should like to know once for all why arrear pay should be paid to officers whose reorganization has been sanctioned by the Secretary of State. I tabled questions with a view to ascertaining whether any arrear pay has been paid. The Accountant-General is still preparing the statement in answer to my question. I am not therefore in a position to know as to why these services should get arrears of pay paid more especially when we are in financial difficulties. The usual argument will be urged that other services had been paid and this service should also be paid. I wish to know the circumstances under which this arrear pay has been sanctioned and whether it is obligatory on the part of the Government to make these payments to these services. If it is not obligatory, I would certainly press this resolution."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, it is undeniably obligatory. The particular reason is that in sanctioning the revision of pay, the Secretary of State specifically fixed the date from which the revision should take place. This date is known to all the officers themselves and it is not possible to go back upon it. There is another point which I venture to take at an early stage, and that is, that the greater part of these Rs. 30,000 appertains to the pay of officers of the Imperial Forest Service. If opportunity had been given to me, I should have pointed out at the proper time and in the proper quarter that probably at least Rs. 25,000 came under a non-votable head."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Notwithstanding the explanation and information given by the Hon'ble the Home Member, I think it is necessary at this stage to consider on what principle these dates are fixed. In reply to a question put this morning we find a reference to the all-India services and to the dates from which the revision of salaries has been given effect to. A perusal of the list will indicate that in some cases the revision was given effect to from the 1st December 1918, in some cases from different dates in 1919, and in some other cases from 1920. We now find a lump provision for the revision of salaries of the officers of the Forest Department. Not that I grudge that, but I want that a fair treatment should be given to all officers alike. What causes irritation is that in some cases the revision is so arranged as to get the officers concerned increase from 1918, in some cases from 1919, in some cases from 1920, and in some others from 1921. I venture to suggest that an examination might be made into the necessity for such a thing and that equal justice might be done to all officers and departments alike. Yesterday this House was hearing a motion made in reference to the pay and prospects of the Deputy Collectors and very naturally it was stated by the Government that their case had not been treated properly. To-day when we raised objection in connexion with the lump provision for officers of the Excise Department it was asked if they are to be treated in an unfair manner. When we now come to a similar provision for the Forest Department it is perfectly natural to find that those contentions are repeated. We are all aware of the difficulties to which these officers are put. But what we ask for is some definite principle by which all officers should be given equal facilities. That one set of persons should get arrear salary in 1918, another in 1919, some in 1920 and others still more miserable only in 1921 is a thing which requires very careful examination. It is this aspect of the matter that I wish to place before the House in making this motion—

31. *That under 8-B. Forest the lump provision of Rs. 30,000 on account of the payment of arrears—Salaries to the Imperial and Provincial Forest Service be omitted (Budget page 52)."*

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

[22nd March 1921]

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

' 32. *That the demand for Rs. 3,000 being lump provision on account of the payment of arrear salaries for Imperial and Provincial Forest Services consequent on revision of pay under detailed account No. 8-B. Forest—Establishment be reduced to Re. 1 (Budget page 52).*'

"I beg to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that whereas arrears of salaries have been paid in respect of high-paid officers, such as Deputy Collectors and other high officials, not a word is said about the non-gazetted officers, and in respect of which it was only stated that there are no funds to pay; but the same argument applied with regard to others also. It is said that it is only a small amount of money that we want in the case of higher officers but that a very large amount is required in the case of the non-gazetted officers. We find in the report of the Salaries Committee of this House which sat in connexion with the salaries of the non-gazetted officers that we are unable to give retrospective effect to the sanction because, as the Hon'ble the Finance Member said, that if he gives effect to all our demands he will require about 70 lakhs. I agree with that. But what reason is there to give back pay only to superior officers? When we now find

3-46 p.m.

ourselves face to face with these financial difficulties, there is absolutely no reason why these high-paid officers alone should be paid more. If it is said that these people would be placed under special difficulties or would be in a disadvantageous position, which others of the superior department have not got to face, I would only say that if the whole body of the non-gazetted officers have to be working under a disability, let these officers also be under that disability. The Hon'ble the Finance Member has stated in his memorandum that when provision is made for retrenchment, or when economy is thought of, these high-paid officers will certainly come to our rescue. I do expect, Sir, these very well-paid officers to come to our rescue. High-paid officers have been given this privilege and the whole body of the non-gazetted officers is not to be given this privilege; I submit, Sir, that there is no necessity to give it to them especially when, as has been said yesterday, the question has to be gone into to find out how far retrenchment is to be thought of, and especially at a time when we are face to face with the fact that we are not able to give effect to it in the case of non-gazetted officers. I submit, Sir, that to give effect to it, whatever it may be, in the case of high officers only would only be augmenting the discontent that is prevailing among the non-gazetted officers and the Salaries Committee has pointed out that the cry on the part of the non-gazetted officers has been the result of practically giving effect to the scales already sanctioned in the case of superior officers. All the same I may draw the attention of the House to the fact that when there is a volume of discontent that, while higher officers are treated fairly, while persons drawing Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 4,000 a month have been given arrears of salaries, there is absolutely no reason why these poor paid body of clerks whose case is more deserving of consideration and sympathy at our hands should be refused these advantages. Therefore I submit, Sir, that it is for this purpose I say that if we could not give anything to the non-gazetted officers, we shall not also give the other people, because the financial situation would not allow it. In these circumstances, I move for the reduction of the provision."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I only wanted to remind the Hon'ble Mr. Krishna Rao when he was making his catalogue of the miserable, the more miserable and the most miserable, that he had omitted to include the most miserable of all the departments in respect of which he proposed to have this revision deferred till 1922. I quite agree that the differences in the dates from which

22nd March 1921]

[The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

effect is to be given to the schemes invite criticism, but after all these dates are the dates sanctioned by the Secretary of State and it is really not in the power of this Council or this Government to go back upon the sanctions which the Secretary of State has given for reasons known to him and which are common to the whole of India."

All the motions were then by leave withdrawn.

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"Sir, the motions that stand in my name read—

6. *That a sum of Rs. 2,00,000 be deducted out of Rs. 4,10,000 provided for roads and bridges under 8-A. Forest—VII (a) Communication and bridges (Budget page 51).*

7. *That a sum of Rs. 2,00,000 be deducted out of the allotment of Rs. 2,40,000 provided for building under the same head 8-A. Forests, etc.—VII (b) (Budget page 51).*

"Now, Sir, I shall take each separately and I have to make one speech summarising them. In the case of the first one, the allotment now made under the head of detailed head of roads and bridges is Rs. 4,10,000. Out of that I ask that two lakhs may be deducted, or in other words that the allotment may be reduced to Rs. 2,10,000. Now, Sir, I may just explain my position in regard to this matter. I quite agree with the Honourable Member in charge that Forest requires a good deal of development. I also equally agree with him that the forest produce should be utilized to the fullest possible extent and I may also agree with him that these roads and bridges are necessary for the forest produce to find its way to the nearest province. But when there is want of money everywhere, when there is cry for the salaries of non-gazetted officers, when there is a clamour on the part of the village officers for more pay and for more allowances and when so many useful services such as education, sanitation, medical relief, etc., are being starved, I do not for a moment agree, Sir, that we should make such a large allotment for roads and bridges in the case of the Forest Department. In other words, what I wish to submit to the Council is that Forest should not obtain a sort of preferential treatment when there is want of money everywhere. When we have got an adversity budget and we want money all round for the development of all departments, the Department of Industry for instance, and when we have to provide for other departments, we should not be so liberal in the case of this department. I would ask the Honourable Member in charge whether it is not possible to reduce this amount by 2 lakhs and whether the whole sum is likely to be utilized in the course of this year, whether all that would be spent on any new roads and bridges, whether estimates have been sanctioned, or if not, whether old works will be continued. In any view, if roads or bridges are continued during the year, I do not for a moment think that this Rs. 4,10,000 could be usefully spent during the year. But let me not be misunderstood as suggesting that these are not useful projects and the money is not well spent on these.

"Similarly I suppose there is an allotment of Rs. 2,40,000 out of which I ask for the reduction of 2 lakhs. I want that allotment to be reduced and I want that a provision of only Rs. 40,000 be made in the budget. Now the question of scarcity arises. Can we not hold up this amount for one year at least out of this allotment? We require money for so many useful purposes and we should not be so over-liberal in the case of the Forest Department when the result of allowing such a large allotment in the case of one particular department will be to starve entirely many other useful departments. With these words, Sir, I commend this resolution to the acceptance of the House."

[Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

[22nd March 1921]

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"Sir, I beg to oppose this motion on this ground that under Forest Conservancy and Works (8-A) 25 lakhs and odd is provided for and under Establishment 30 lakhs and odd. If we are going to sanction 38 Deputy and Assistant Conservators as against 27 for last year and another 48 Extra Assistant Conservators as against 45 and go on increasing the establishment without giving them roads and bridges, what are these Assistant Conservators, etc., to do? They will say 'It is not possible for us and so we have stopped going into the district.' I do not grudge to give money to roads and bridges so as to enable these officers to go about and see and also to enable foresters and rangers to go and look after these forests and to develop them. I do not think that any consideration with regard to the pay of the non-gazetted officers and all such matters should weigh in regard to the provision for roads and bridges and the provision for buildings which are quite necessary for the purpose of developing this forest revenue and for the purpose of getting the proper work from the large number of increased officers whom we have provided for and in whose provision we have got absolutely no voice because they are all italicised."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, the position as stated by the last speaker is substantially accurate. I am sorry I was not ready earlier in the day to deal with this resolution. As I have explained, it was not put into my hands until after I arrived here this morning. In the interval the Chief Conservator, Mr. Cox, has kindly placed me in possession of details on the subject. I find that the sum of Rs. 4,10,000 which the Honourable Mover wishes to reduce by 2 lakhs is practically entirely devoted to works which are calculated to produce revenue. Mr. Cox has classified these under four main heads. First of all, no less than 109 cart-tracks and roads, purely for the exploitation of forest produce, Rs. 81,000 and odd. Then comes under the second head the completion of works already in progress, including two important roads on the Javadi hills, another item badly needed for development and accounting for a little under a lakh. Next provision of nearly a lakh and a half for the construction of new roads at Mount Stuart, for the development of the Tinnevely evergreen forests, for the opening up of the Nallamalai forests, for special exploitation work at Chenai Nair and for the construction of feeder roads to the saw-mill at Russellkonda. This last item is a matter of Rs. 10,000 and I don't think that we need strike it out, for whatever resolution this Council may have passed, the Goomsur timber has to come down to Russellkonda whether or not it passes on beyond that place. There is yet another item of Rs. 18,000 for miscellaneous works. I come now to the fourth and last head, the repairs and upkeep of existing roads about three-quarters of a lakh. If the Council makes any reduction in the 4 lakhs estimate for roads and bridges, all I can say is that I shall have to approach my Honourable Colleague on my right for alterations on the receipt side of the Forest budget; and I may add, Sir, though it is not strictly relevant to this resolution, that the deletion of provision for the saw-mill at Russellkonda will also undoubtedly involve a substantial reduction on the receipt side. So much for roads.

"I come next to buildings. What we have left in the budget for buildings is 2.40 lakhs. It is stated that this provision is over-liberal.

4 p.m.

I should like the Honourable Mover to know that the Chief Conservator's original demand was not for 2 lakhs but for 3.60 lakhs. He justified his demand *inter alia* by stating that the works proposed to be undertaken represented arrears left in previous years owing to financial stringency and works at Mount Stuart, Dhone and Russellkonda in connexion with development schemes. The expenditure is required in nearly every district and is evenly distributed

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

throughout the Presidency. New works contribute 66 per cent of the total budget allotment, completion of existing works 14 per cent and repairs and upkeep 16 per cent. . . . In nearly every district the housing of the staff, the provision of accommodation for subordinate offices and for inspecting officers is a very urgent matter, attention to which can no longer be delayed. The vast majority of the works proposed by the Conservators are small and within the powers of sanction of the local officers. For more than half of the works, estimates have been prepared and sanctioned and the execution of the works themselves has only been delayed for want of funds in previous years'.

"I hope the statement that I have made will induce the Honourable Member not to press his motion. That was the Chief Conservator's justification for a budget grant of Rs. 3.60 lakhs, but a hard-hearted Government, seeking economies in every direction for increases of salaries to non-gazetted officers and others, struck out over a lakh and reduced it to 2.40 lakhs. In these circumstances, Sir, it is quite impossible for me to agree to the suggestion that the provision of 2.40 lakhs should now be reduced to Rs. 40,000. The latter figure would be precisely Rs. 16,000 less than what is necessary for the maintenance of existing buildings."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"I do not press the motions."

The motions were by leave withdrawn.

The following motions not having been moved were deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

19. *Omit duty allowance for Extra Assistant Conservator in Parlakimedi Maliahs, Rs. 600 (Budget, page 52).*

38. *Omit duty allowance to head clerks (Budget, page 53), Rs. 2,640.*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

20. *Omit duty allowance to Extra Assistant Conservator, Parlakimedi Maliahs, Rs. 600 (Budget, page 52).*

37. *Omit duty allowance to head clerks under District Forest establishment (Budget, page 53), Rs. 2,640.*

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—

36. *Delete Rs. 2, 40, duty allowance to head clerks (Budget, page 53).*

The following resolution was deemed to have been withdrawn, the mover being absent :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

21. *That under 8-B. Forests the duty allowance of Rs. 600 for Extra Assistant Conservator of Forests, Parlakimedi, be omitted (Budget, page 52).*

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"Then there are three motions which I propose to take up together. All of them appertain to the provision of Rs. 5 lakhs for travelling allowance under 8-B."

The following three motions were then taken up together for consideration :—

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—

39. *That the provision for travelling allowance of Rs. 5 lakhs under 8-B. (Budget, page 54) be reduced to Rs. 3,00,000.*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

40. *That the travelling allowance of Rs. 5 lakhs in 8-B. Forest—Establishment be reduced by one lakh (Budget, page 54).*

[Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

[22nd March 1921]

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—

41. *That the travelling allowance of Rs. 5,00,000 in 8-B. Forest—Establishment be reduced by one lakh (Budget, page 54).*

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—“The same reason that I have been advancing in regard to travelling allowance in the case of the officers of the Excise department will also apply to this. I think the provision of 5 lakhs of rupees for travelling allowance for an establishment costing about 15 lakhs is too much and I therefore think that this House should impress upon those officers that travelling should be done not for the purpose of drawing travelling allowance because so much allotment is available but for the purpose of necessity. If the Hon'ble the Finance Member will agree even to the reduction of one lakh proposed by Messrs. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju and L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar, I will be very much satisfied.”

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“In view of what was stated yesterday, I do not press my motion.”

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—“I do not also propose to press my motion in view of what had happened already on this question.”

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—“If the Honourable Member will give me an assurance that travelling will not be resorted to unnecessarily, I will not press this motion.”

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I cannot give the Honourable Member any such assurance. This provision of 5 lakhs is simply a question of arithmetic. The rates of mileage and daily allowance had been revised in a Government Order of the 18th February 1921. One result of that revision was that the Finance Department of the Secretariat automatically raised the Chief Conservator's provision from 4 lakhs to 5 lakhs.”

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—“I withdraw the motion.”

The motions were by leave withdrawn.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“The following motions of Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar will now be taken up :—

22. *Delete Rs. 900, local allowance to the Forest Research Officer (Budget, page 52).*

23. *Delete Rs. 1,200, local allowance for the two instructors of the Forest College (Budget, page 52).*

33. *Delete Rs. 5,460, personal allowance to rangers (Budget, page 53).*

34. *Delete Rs. 1,446, personal allowance to foresters (Budget, page 53).*

35. *Delete Rs. 2,604, personal allowance to three veterinary assistants (Budget, page 53).*

42. *Reduce Rs. 80,000 provided for sundries by Rs. 50,000 (Budget, page 54).*”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—“With regard to the first two motions, I do not wish to move them, because my motions about superior officers are not binding on the Government. I do not want to make any difference between the Provincial and the Imperial officers. With regard to the others, I want information as to the reasons for which those provisions are made. The first three are personal allowances and the last item is for sundries. The last is such a large amount that I should like to be enlightened as to the purpose for which it is intended.”

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I think the reason underlying items 33, 34 and 35 is the same as that stated by my hon'ble colleague Mr. Todhunter in regard to similar cases of personal allowance appearing under other budget heads. They are simply sums necessary to prevent the recipients of revised scales of pay from being financial losers and make up the difference between the pay which they were formerly drawing together with war allowance and the lower aggregate revised pay which they will be drawing under the new scheme.

“ In regard to the other item of Rs. 80,000 I should like to draw the attention of the House to the relevant details at the bottom of page 54 of the budget under the sub-head ‘ Sundries.’ It will then be seen, Sir, that it is only a repetition of the same provision in the revised ‘ estimate’ of the current year. I understand it covers the case of supplies to forest subordinates of clothing, equipment and the like. The details are not immediately before Government and I cannot say exactly what they are. But the supplies are for the most part intended for foresters and other subordinates working, many of them working, in out-of-the-way places, for instance, forest guards whose duties involve special strain on their clothing. I have no doubt that the Chief Conservator's estimate, corresponding closely, as it does, to the revised estimate for the current year, is substantially correct. The amount is somewhat higher than the budget estimate for 1920-21, but this is no doubt due partly to the additional cost of clothing and partly to additions to the strength of the executive establishment of the Forest Department. I think when dealing with the general discussion on the budget I had occasion to mention that the reorganization scheme was being introduced piecemeal, the introduction being spread over for a period of three years, because finances did not permit the immediate introduction of the entire scheme. I believe I am right in saying that one-third of the scheme is coming into force next year. If so, there is the necessity to provide clothing not only for the existing number of subordinates but also for the additional subordinates.”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—“ I do not press the motions.”

The motions were by leave withdrawn.

MOTION FOR REDUCTION OF TOTAL GRANT.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar was deemed to have been withdrawn as the Member did not move it :—

43. *That the grant of Rs. 50,64,858 under 8. Forest be reduced by Rs. 3,00,000 (Budget, page 51).*

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“ I will now put to the House the proposition that the Government be granted, for the administration of the Forest department, the demand of the Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson for Rs. 51·11 lakhs, after deducting the provision of 2·16 lakhs for the Russellkonda saw-mill which the House has disallowed.”

Demand IV, as altered, was then put to the Council and was granted *nem. con.*

DEMAND V—REGISTRATION.

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—“ I beg to introduce to the Council Demand V relating to the Registration department, another transferred subject in charge of the Ministers, for a grant not exceeding Rs. 22·16 lakhs.”

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [22nd March 1921]

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiayar was deemed to have been withdrawn, as the Member was not present :—

1. *That under 9-A Registration the duty allowance to Personal Assistant and Inspector of Registration offices of Rs. 1,800 be omitted (Budget, page 55).*

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju was deemed to have been withdrawn as the Member did not move it :—

2. *That the following item of duty allowance under the following head be omitted :—*

9-A. Registration—Superintendence.

To Personal Assistant and Inspector of Registration offices (Budget, page 55)
Rs. 1,800.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

‘3. *That in 9-A. Registration—Superintendence, the duty allowance Rs. 1,800 of Personal Assistant and Inspector of Registration offices be omitted (Budget, page 55).’*”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—“There is a similar resolution in my name—

‘4. *Delete Rs. 1,800 duty allowance to Personal Assistant and Inspector of Registration offices (Budget, page 55).’*

“I should like to hear the Government reply.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“Mr. President, Sir, this provision of Rs. 1,800 for two officers at the rate of Rs. 75 per month is made as it was thought that the particular duty which they were called upon to do was of an arduous nature and also owing to the fact that they are obliged to live in so costly a place as the Presidency town. I think it is only fair that people who are asked to live in the Presidency town and do more arduous work than their brother district registrars should be allowed this compensatory allowance. It is really a compensatory allowance.”

Diwan Bahadur D. SESHAGIRI RAO :—“I oppose this motion. The Hon'ble the Minister was saying that the Exeise department was the least corrupt of the departments under his control. I wish I could make the same remark with regard to this department. I oppose the motion because I understand that the Personal Assistant inspects the various registration offices in the Presidency. Rs. 1,800 include the personal allowance of the Inspector of Registration offices also. I think this officer cannot be too careful with reference to the inspection of the Registration offices. I am very sorry to remark that most of the registration officers are corrupt to the core. I make this remark with full sense of responsibility, because the loud complaint that is levelled against the Registration department is that several of the Registrars and the Sub-Registrars who are in charge of these registration offices insist upon the payment of as much blackmail as is covered by the stamp duty on the documents that come before them. I say this not to criticize the Government but because I feel sorry that the best intentions of Government are being misconstrued and misinterpreted to the people at large. A department that is intended to secure the best evidence possible of the transactions between man and man is made the vehicle of blackmailing. People come from villages to these officers. On some pretext or other, these Sub-Registrars and Registrars try to keep them off by saying that the document is not in order. The document only comes into order when the blackmail which sometimes is not less than the stamp duty paid is ushered into his hands. This is a very deplorable state of

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. D. Seshagiri Rao.]

things and this will be more deplorable if this personal allowance is not given for the Inspectors of Registration offices. My only hope is that these Inspectors of Registration offices will make the registration offices less corrupt—may I hope also that they may be made honest. These registration offices were aimed to be a close preserve of educated people by the late Colonel McDonald. What a fall it is! I express my regret here with the hope that the Hon'ble the Minister who is in charge of this department will make these offices really popular and justify his having taken over charge under a popular Government."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—"I seriously mean to benefit by this observation."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I wish to say one word in answer to the observations that fell from my honourable friend Mr. Seshagiri Rao and in justice to the large number of officers in the Registration department that are employed in my part of the Presidency. I don't mean to say that there are no blacksheep among them. But I feel bound to say in justice to them that a very large percentage of those who are employed in the Registration department are thoroughly honest. It was only with the object of giving expression to this sentiment that I intervened in this debate. This observation certainly does not go to show that I wish to vote against the resolution if it is pressed. I am at present inclined to vote in its favour. Whether I shall continue in my determination to do so or not will depend upon the arguments that may be advanced hereafter one way or the other in respect of this resolution. I am certainly against all these duty allowances. If I vote against this resolution, that will only be on the ground that this duty allowance is a small allowance of about Rs. 75."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"There are here two officers mentioned in the motion—one is the officer who inspects sub-registry offices and the other is the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration. The first-mentioned officer is a touring officer who inspects all these registration offices. The Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General has nothing to do with the inspection of mufassal offices. It has been said by Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar that this allowance is given to the officer remaining at Madras. Everybody employed at Madras ought to get that duty allowance if that reason is sound. It logically follows then that every official, subordinate or superior, must have a duty allowance attached to his pay. Because he is in Madras he must have a house-rent allowance, charge allowance, presidency allowance, etc."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I strongly support the motion for reduction. The Hon'ble Mr. Seshagiri Rao's reasons were mainly twofold, viz., that if this small allowance of Rs. 75 is given, these Personal Assistants will not get the contagion of dishonesty from the Registrars whose offices they inspect. His argument was that if the subordinate officers were dishonest and if these inspecting people who go out for inspection are not given allowances, they will get this contagion of dishonesty. That was, I understood, the meaning of it."

Diwan Bahadur D. SESHAGIRI RAO (*interrupting*) :—"I never said that this Rs. 75 will make these inspectors more honest. I only say that these people must be given this Rs. 75 which will enable them to make the expensive tours and find out the black sheep."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR (*continuing*) :—"It will be interesting to know the number of sub-registrars in this Presidency and how often these people with these allowances will be able to visit every office every year. The second point

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [22nd March 1921]

in Mr. Seshagiri Rao's argument is this. I do not pity the Sub-Registrars and the Registrars; but I pity the Hon'ble Mr. Seshagiri Rao who has come into contact with only a few of them. I join with Mr. Krishnan Nayar in saying that these registrars and sub-registrars are honest as a class. So far as registrars are concerned, many of the vakils appear before them in connexion with appeals for registration of documents. I have not heard of any case in which any corruption has been alleged in the case of the registrars. As for sub-registrars, we know how difficult their circumstances are and how little chance they have got for corruption. It may be in some cases, perhaps it will be one per cent, that they may get some tips to advance the registration of the document. To say that every document is not registered unless the whole stamp fee is paid a second time is a gross libel for which there is no foundation, at least so far as my district and some neighbouring districts are concerned. Therefore on these two conditions, that there is no corruption at all for these inspectors to check and secondly that the additional grant of Rs. 75 is for only two inspectors who may not be able to visit one sub-registrar's office at least once every year. On both these grounds there is no meaning in giving this allowance to these people. So I support this reduction."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, my position is rather a peculiar one. To some extent, I agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Seshagiri Rao that there are a considerable number of officials who are dishonest. At the same time, I am not for the present allowance being given to the inspector of registration offices.

"Circumstances are now different from what they were before. Now there is a Joint Registrar attached to many districts, and the District Registrar may be expected to go on inspection work and to put an end to corruption. I think there is no need now for the appointment of an inspector of registration offices. This one officer is not going to inspect every office. It is better to do away with the appointment itself, and as a step towards that I think the allowances should not be given."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I beg to oppose this resolution. There is no question that duty allowances should be given to the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General. He is in the grade of a District Registrar. The Inspector also is an officer of the District Registrar's grade. The Inspector has to go and inspect sub-registrars' offices and not District Registrars' offices. On the general ground that officers in Madras have to undergo a greater expenditure, they ought to be given Rs. 75 a month, as is given in the case of all other officers. I therefore oppose this resolution."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"It will probably be to the convenience of the House to split this motion into two parts. I understand from the Honourable the mover that he has no objection to the duty allowance in the case of the inspectors. But he objected to the allowance in the case of the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General. There are two allowances now in question. I shall now put the first allowance, namely, the allowance to the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General."

This motion was put and lost.

The other part of the resolution was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar did not make the following motions standing in his name:—

5. Delete Rs. 6,984, personal allowance to Sub-Registrars (Budget, page 56).
6. Delete Rs. 5,274, personal allowance to clerks (Budget, page 56).

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

The motions were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju did not make the following motion standing in his name :—

7. *Omit duty allowance to the Registrar of Madras—*

Chingleput, (Budget, page 57) Rs. 900

The motion was deemed to have been withdrawn.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR then moved :—

8. *Delete Rs. 900, duty allowance to the Registrar of Madras-Chingleput (Budget, page 57).*

15. *Delete Rs. 6,900, duty allowance to senior clerks in sub-registry offices (Budget, page 57).*

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—“I do not press my motions, Sir, if the Honourable Member gives me the information as to—

- (i) the headquarters for the Registrar of Madras-Chingleput ;
- (ii) on what grounds the personal allowances have been granted ; and
- (iii) why the senior clerks should be granted this allowance.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“The headquarters is Madras, Sir. As regards the personal allowances they come under the same category as other personal allowances being merely compensatory allowance due to regrading of the services, and they will automatically disappear when the salaries are revised. As regards duty allowance to the senior clerks of Sub-Registrars' offices, it was allowed on the recommendation that when there are several clerks drawing practically the same pay, the head clerk should have some additional allowance to distinguish him from the other clerks.”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—“I do not want to press the motion, Sir.”

The motions were then by leave withdrawn.

The following motions were not made and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

9. *Omit duty allowance to the Registrar of Madras-Chingleput, Rs. 900 (Budget, page 57).*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

10. *Omit duty allowance to typists of advanced grade, Rs. 240 (Budget, page 57).*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

11. *Omit duty allowance to typists of advanced grade, Rs. 240 (Budget, page 57).*

12. *Omit duty allowance to Probationary Sub-Registrars when in charge of sub-registry offices, Rs. 7,200 (Budget, page 57).*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

13. *Omit duty allowance to Probationary Sub-Registrars when in charge of sub-registry offices, Rs. 7,200 (Budget, page 57).*

14. *Omit duty allowance to senior clerks in sub-registry offices with establishments of five clerks and upwards, Rs. 6,900 (Budget, page 57).*

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [22nd March 1921]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

16. *Omit duty allowance to senior clerks in charge of sub-registry offices* Rs. 900 (*Budget, page 57*).

Demand V for Rs. 22.16 lakhs was then put to the Council and was granted *nem. con.*

DEMAND VI—MISCELLANEOUS IRRIGATION EXPENDITURE.

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“ I have now the honour to ask for a demand of 60.78 lakhs in respect of irrigation. The details are to be found on page 6 of this schedule. The various details in connexion with each separate main head are to be found in the budget which is in the hands of the honourable members.”

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to move—

1. *That in 15-A, Miscellaneous Irrigation Expenditure Rs. 1,112, personal allowance, to be deleted (Budget, page 59).*

“ I like to be informed as to the reasons for the personal allowance being granted.”

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
“ I will merely state that this allowance is also for the reason that I have already given.”

The motion was then by leave withdrawn.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I beg to move—

‘ 2. *That the demand of Rs. 17,54,545 under 15-B Miscellaneous Irrigation Expenditure be reduced by Rs. 100 (Budget, page 59).*’

“ Sir, the object of my motion is to elicit from my honourable friend the
4-30 p.m. Member for Land Revenue and Irrigation a statement as regards

the various projects which are now under investigation. There are many schemes which have been under investigation and in previous years honourable members had asked for information and also had suggested that the investigation and afterwards the carrying out of these schemes should be expedited as much as possible. I would mention a few of them.

“ In the Guntur district there is a project called the Atleru Project, which has been pending since 1903-04. My honourable friend Mr. Krishna Rao asked a question and it was then stated that the project had been awaiting the result of gauging operations of the river for a year in which the rainfall does not exceed 20". It has been, as I said, pending from 1903-04. The Guntur-Pulikonda Reservoir Project has also been pending from 1903-04. It was then stated ‘ that the estimate for the work was held in abeyance pending the settlement of the question of the supply available, to ascertain which gaugings were being made. Five years’ gauge readings have been taken and the further examination of the project will now be undertaken.’ That was the reply made in the year 1916. Then in regard to the Guntur-Gundlakamma Project which has been pending since 1901-02 it was stated that ‘ plans and estimates were held over, pending the results of gaugings to ascertain the quantity of water available for storage.’ That was also in the same year.

“ Then in regard to the Nellore-Pyderu Project, the information given was that the project was under consideration and that the ‘ plans and estimates received from the Superintending Engineer had been returned to him for revision.’

22nd March 1921] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

"Then, Sir, comes the Nellore-Boggeru Project. This has been held over since 1903-04 and it was stated 'the investigation of this project has been completed. The plans and estimates are under the consideration of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.' Nothing is stated in the budget as to what became of this project.

"Then there are other projects such as Nellore-Vengalapuram Project, Cuddapah-Ithodu Project, Chingleput-Uttiramerur Project which has been pending since 1904-05, and Chingleput-Madurantakam Project, all of which have been allowed to lie over for several years. There are also two projects in the Salem district which have been pending so far back as 1902-03 and 1904-05. There are altogether 19 irrigation projects which have been pending for several years, say 20 years and more. I should like to know the state of these irrigation projects. After all, I submit, Sir, that the well-being of the ryots depends upon the rapid extension of irrigation. We do not see any of these projects in the estimates, and I should like to impress upon the Hon'ble Member that people desire very much a rapid investigation of all these projects and I should like to impress also on the Finance Member for financing these projects as far as possible by loans from the Government of India. Therefore, I desire information on these matters and I trust the honourable member will do his best to expedite the investigation and consideration of these schemes and furnish details."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—
 "I am exceedingly thankful to the honourable member for having once more drawn my attention to the need and the necessity for the development of the irrigation resources of this province. I think I have on previous occasions, when an opportunity presented itself to me, whole-heartedly identified myself with the interests of the people and I think I can hold out the assurance that as far as lies in my power everything which would advance their interests will receive my best attention. So far as this particular motion goes, I think I can merely state for the information of the honourable mover who has brought it up that the sum of Rs. 17,50,000 and odd which has been entered in the budget estimate comprises of a few heads of expenditure which generally fall under what are called old maintenance charges of ordinary works, Tank Restoration Scheme repairs, minor works, works in charge of Public Works department, works in charge of Revenue department and surveys of irrigation projects, etc. The amounts which appear under each one of these special heads will be found in a separate budget which, I take it, is in the hands of the honourable members of this Council and is called the Public Works Irrigation estimate. The various works for which provision has been entered against each head are also to be found in the pages of the same volume. I see, Sir, that the honourable member who has brought forward this resolution is not quite satisfied with the provision that has been made for the next year and that he is anxious that schemes which have been under investigation for some years past and schemes in regard to which some definite promise had been made in the previous years, as also schemes which will be of considerable advantage to the ryots of this province should be expedited. May I at this juncture merely assure my honourable friend that everything that is possible in that direction will be done, provided of course the necessary funds are forthcoming? Some of them are productive works and others are protective works. Each scheme is examined as it relates to productive or protective. There are occasions when productive works have to be undertaken, while there are also occasions when productive works have to make room for protective works, and even in cases of productive works the results that are to be expected have got to be carefully scrutinized, inasmuch as the money which is spent in that respect is invariably from borrowed capital. In view of the

[The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [22nd March 1921]

various aspects involved in the examination of this question, I am not at the present moment in a position to assure my honourable friend as to which particular scheme it may be possible for me to give preference or as to which particular scheme could be expedited, but I will certainly say that all the pending schemes will be examined and those that are found practicable and those for which money could be found will be rushed through. If that assurance of mine satisfies my honourable friend, I think it will be unnecessary for him to press his resolution for the reduction of Rs. 100."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I do not really know what my honourable friend is going to do upon the information given by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member. But what is the information which he has placed at our disposal? He has told us that he will do his best, do whatever is possible for him to further the cause of the ryots, provided money is found and provided circumstances permit. So far as this answer is concerned, I think it is no assurance at all. We all expect members of Government to pay that amount of attention that is necessary to carry out the works under their control. We do not expect any member of Government to say 'We are not going to further the cause of irrigation, we are not going to further the cause of the ryots'. But what the House really expects is that some definite statement is made by the Government as to the extent to which and the manner in which further impetus would be given in the way of improving the irrigation works. The House always expects some definite information as to whether any irrigation works are likely to be taken up in the near future and what amount of money at any rate is likely to be placed at the disposal by the Government in the course of a certain number of years and what results are likely to be achieved within that period of time. It is only information of that description that can satisfy the honourable members of this House."

"Sir, the previous history of this question relating to the spread and development of these irrigation works shows that we must move much faster and on more well-marked lines than we have been doing hitherto. Series of questions have been asked in this Council for several years as to the way in which the various works of irrigation were taken up and as to the way in which their investigation went on. For several years we have been spending lakhs and lakhs of rupees on investigation and it may prove in some cases that we had better not proceed with the works but save further cost. I am not going to question the accuracy of the statements made in reply to the various questions put in this Council, but the people of this province are entitled to know as to the actual results of the various steps taken by the Government to further the cause of irrigation and to be benefited thereby. I must state that the results are not satisfactory. Though by means of this motion for reduction of Rs. 100 this question is raised, I hope the Hon'ble Member for Revenue, who has been very solicitous in expounding the cause of the ryots, will make some more definite statement as to the rate at which these schemes will be developed and as to the period within which we may expect some definite improvement in the cause of irrigation. If no such information is given, I, for one, will not be satisfied with the assurance."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"It may be the orthodox Parliamentary form of calling attention to what is regarded as matter for dissatisfaction but I would suggest, Sir, that if, as the honourable member says, 19 irrigation schemes have remained in abeyance for a long period of time, the obvious course for him would have been to put specific questions on the subject. It would have been possible for the honourable member in charge of the department to ascertain from the Chief Engineer what factors have delayed the progress of these schemes and the

22nd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

honourable member would have had some chance of getting concrete information on the point. Otherwise how can he expect my honourable colleague to be prepared with exact information as to the reasons which have delayed all or any of these 19 or 20 schemes? Surely, if the honourable member's grievance relates to the way in which the question of irrigation has been dealt with in the past, his natural remedy is to put questions in this Council and, if the answers given to his questions are not adequate, then to move a resolution on a matter of general public interest. It is not as if we had any paucity of resolutions on budget matter proper, for we have had over 400 such resolutions. In the interests of expedition and the time of this House, I would urge that the method of moving petty reductions of grants merely to draw attention to certain points be not adopted by other members of this Council."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Mr. President, for exactly the reasons which the Hon'ble the Home Member has stated I wish to press this resolution. I want to establish in this Council the practice of calling attention of the House to these matters exactly in the same way as is done in the House of Commons. So far as I am concerned, I did not want to take the Hon'ble the Revenue Member by surprise. I intimated to my friend the Revenue Member this morning what information I required. It is certainly open to my friend to say that he is not quite prepared to give the information. But as regards the right of this House to call for information in this manner, I say that this is a right which is in consonance with the well-established practice in Parliament. I therefore press this motion."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"By way of personal explanation, I want to say one word. I did not wish to say that that method was unconstitutional or irregular, but I appealed to the members of the House not to adopt it."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, but for Sir Lionel Davidson's speech I might have voted against Mr. Ramachandra Rao's resolution. As it is I feel I am bound to vote for it and I believe that that should be the attitude we are to take. I quite appreciate the difficulty which the Hon'ble the Revenue Member may experience in giving the information, but after all the object of the debate is to elicit information as to the policy of Government as regards the revenue administration in particular cases and we expect honourable members of the Government to be prepared to defend the departments of which they are in charge. It is quite true that non-official members prepare themselves with respect to particular resolutions and particular points which they wish to press, but so far as members of Government are concerned, it is an unfortunate position. Having accepted that position, they are bound to be always ready with information if the constitutional procedure admits. If the constitutional procedure does not admit, then it is another point. If the procedure permits it, it is the duty of the members to give such answers, subject to the ruling of the President. If you, Sir (turning to the President) rule it out, it is another matter. But once a resolution has been tabled, then everybody knows that that will raise a debate. The whole administration of this Irrigation department should have been within the knowledge of the Hon'ble the Revenue Member. I am not at all casting a personal reflection. I rather appreciate the difficulty of the honourable member. But I do suggest that when a great deal of attention is paid to the conduct of the non-official members in moving resolutions, etc., I do think that members of this House have a right to expect members of Government to be ready with all information and details on particular matters and to defend the policy of the Government."

[Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai]

[22nd March 1921]

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—“ I wish to say a few words on the question of irrigation. The repair and maintenance of sources of irrigation is the most important matter. There are more than 40,000 tanks in this Presidency of which no less than 30,000 tanks belong to class IV. Minor works in charge of Civil Officers. The largest source of revenue is Land Revenue and this depends on the successful wet cultivation of the areas under the tanks. The tanks are more or less completely out of order. So far as I know in the southern parts of the Presidency the bunds of tanks are in many cases weak or leaky, the sluices broken down or the calingulas shattered. There has been a long correspondence regarding the tank restoration and tank repairs. Finally a conference was held at Ootacamund the results of which were embodied in G.O. No. 572, dated 13th December 1912. The order of the Government is as follows :—

‘ The Government accept the recommendations of the conference.

‘ 2. The attention of Superintending Engineers is drawn to the discussions of the conference on proposals numbered (1) to (8) and the conclusions arrived at thereon.

‘ 3. As regards the formation of a new Tank Restoration Scheme Party in I Circle referred to in recommendation No. II, orders have been issued in G.O. No. 1643 W., dated 16th November 1912.

‘ 4. With reference to recommendation No. III the Collector of Anantapur will arrange, in consultation with the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, to post one or two special tahsildars to collect labour for the execution of Tank Restoration Scheme works in that district.

‘ 5. As regards recommendation No. VII Executive Engineers will be empowered, subject to the provisions of article 779 of the Public Works Code, to grant to village headmen, or to persons of equal local importance, advances of money in order to start a work not exceeding the first month's estimated expenditure on it. The advances will only be given in special circumstances and after consultation with the special tahsildar.

‘ 6. The Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, expects to be able to improve the outturn of work in his circle by spreading his operations over a wider area, and an application from the Superintending Engineer for an increase of establishment is under the consideration of the Government.

‘ 7. The Governor in Council confidently anticipates a better rate of progress in future years and Superintending Engineers should frame their budget proposals with a due regard to the possibility of securing a higher outturn of work than in the past.’

“ The Irrigation Commission has recommended that not less than Rs. 13 lakhs should be spent on the repairs and restoration of the tanks and that at that rate it would take 15 years to complete the work. Since the above conference, what progress has been done it is not known. No substantial progress seems to have been done. The present neglected state of these tanks is simply deplorable. Year after year serious loss is caused to the ryots and the revenue. In the budget before us only 5 and odd lakhs is provided which is quite insufficient. The matter of tank restoration and repairs calls for immediate attention of the Government.”

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—“ I move that the question be now put.”

The motion for closure was put to the vote and carried.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“ Before I put this motion to the Council, I think that in view of the constitutional point that has been raised by the honourable mover and about which the Hon'ble the Home Member has spoken, I should say at once that that question is not either for the honourable mover or for the

22nd March 1921]

[The Hon'ble the President]

Hon'ble the Home Member or for the matter of that for the House to decide, but it is for me to decide it. When I have once tabled a resolution, it is perfectly in order. Having said that, I want Honourable Members to realize clearly the consequence of passing this resolution. It is not really a question of saving a Rs. 100, which is quite a small sum. That the Honourable Member is entitled to table a resolution like that is beyond question. I have allowed the resolution and that settles it. Some Honourable Members may be under the impression that the question of their privilege is at stake and that now they must assert their right and pass this motion. It is not at all necessary for them to pass the resolution in order to assert their right. The privileges of Honourable Members are quite safe in my hands. What the Honourable Members would be committing themselves to by passing this motion will be that the speech made by the Hon'ble the Member for Irrigation has been so very unsatisfactory that the House has marked its disapproval of it. That is a very serious position to take up. I hope the Honourable Members will consider the full significance of it most carefully before they pass a resolution like that. It is not for me to say that they should or should not do so. As this is the first time that this kind of motion is put forward, it is my duty to explain —”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ May I have a word of say before you put the motion to the House ? ”

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I would rise to a point of order.”

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“ I must finish. If the Honourable Members pass the motion they will be committing themselves to the view which I have above stated. The President does not take any sides. He has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of any question, but it is his duty to see that Honourable Members understand what it is that they pass or vote upon. Therefore it is my duty to explain to the Honourable Members that by passing this resolution they would be passing a vote of censure upon the Member for Irrigation. It is not for me to say whether he deserves it or not. The Honourable Members will have to make up their minds as to whether the speech he has made was such as to merit the severe condemnation of him which this motion proposes. Unfortunately I was not here when the greater portion of the speech was delivered. I have only the Deputy President's statement of what it was. Honourable Members will no doubt remember that the honourable mover gave the Hon'ble the Member for Public Works a notice this morning of various points that he was asked to consider. If the House considers that time was sufficient for the Public Works Member to give a full and satisfactory reply, he may be censured. If the House considers that it was not sufficient, that also is a matter for them to decide. I have explained the whole implication of the vote. I would ask the honourable the mover to consider whether he considers that public interests will be served —”

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ I rise to a point of order. A motion cannot be withdrawn after the motion for closure is carried.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I want to make a personal explanation.”

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“ Personal explanations can always be made. I understand the honourable mover is making a personal explanation.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ My original intention in tabling this motion was to obtain information and after obtaining the information and after hearing what the Hon'ble the Revenue Member had to say, to

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [22nd March 1921]

withdraw the motion. But as the Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson has challenged the right of the House——."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Pardon me. I have challenged no right of the House. I merely implored the Members of the House not to exercise their right of voting in favour of the motion, a right which I concede."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Under these circumstances it seems to me that though the reply of the Hon'ble the Revenue Member is unsatisfactory I do not think I shall take the extreme step of censuring my honourable friend by this motion. It was not my intention. So I beg to withdraw the motion."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" I will pass a ruling upon the question of the Honourable Member who objected to the withdrawal of the motion. He is perfectly right. At this stage it cannot be withdrawn. I am therefore bound to put it. If the House considers that the reply of the Public Works Member is satisfactory, they could vote against it."

The motion was put to the vote and declared lost, 11 voting for the motion and 56 against.

The following motion was deemed to have been withdrawn, the mover being absent :—

5 P.M.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—

'3. That the following alteration be made in 30-A. Scientific Department—
Hydro-Electric Surveys :—

Delete Rs. 806 deputation allowance (Budget, page 119).

Demand VI was then put to the Council and was granted *nem con.*

DEMAND VII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—HEADS OF PROVINCES AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" I beg to move Demand VII."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" Sir, I beg to move—

That the provision of Rs. 55,000 for Government House furniture be deleted from the budget (Budget, page 62).'

"Sir, you will see from page 62 of the budget that for the year 1920-21 Rs. 20,020 is provided; in the revised estimate for 1920-21 there is Rs. 50,300; again, now in the budget for 1921-22 Rs. 55,000 is provided. Sir, this amount of Rs. 55,000 is not a small amount. It is more than half a lakh of rupees. This is not an urgent necessity. This is only a luxury. Most of the members of this House had the privilege of attending parties in the Government House and in the different Government Houses, and they will agree with me when I say that all the Government Houses are profusely furnished; in some places they overflow. Such being the case, there is no necessity to ask for a grant of Rs. 55,000 to add some more furniture to the Government House. Mr. President, we want money for more urgent purposes. I need not say that, because the members of this House have been fighting for economy for the last few days and His Excellency himself has undertaken to cut away extra expenditure. He is sure to set a better example by allowing this Rs. 55,000 to be deleted from the budget, and I am sure that His Excellency will not be very particular under the circumstances that this extra grant of Rs. 55,000 should be sanctioned. With these few words, Mr. President, I ask for the deletion of this amount."

22nd March 1921] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I have given notice not, Sir, for the deletion of the whole amount but for a reduction. The Hon'ble Member Mr. Rama Rao referred to the figures for 1920-21. This is not a case where the furniture expense has been curtailed very much till now since the beginning of the war; for, if we go a year previously, in 1919-20, we see Rs. 1,30,620 has been spent upon furniture, and therefore a fairly good number of furniture should have been supplied only two years ago and also all the necessary repairs might have been made. Still my idea was that to curtail the whole amount would not be advisable because some urgent repairs might become necessary. By even curtailing by Rs. 25,000 there will still be Rs. 30,000 which will be more than the budget estimate for 1920-21. It should not in the least be said that we are in any way doing anything against His Excellency by this curtailment. We have great confidence in His Excellency, his popularity and his willingness to serve the masses. Knowing, as His Excellency does, the difficult position in which the subordinate services are placed, the difficult position in which the menials and village officers are, His Excellency, I think, if we only make a proper representation, will agree to a small reduction in the allowance made for furniture, and it will set a very good example for others if His Excellency himself has, at a little sacrifice of his own convenience, agreed to make a reduction in the grant for His Excellency's furniture. Thus it will be a very good lesson if His Excellency goes to the various offices and says: 'Well, you must all reduce your expenditure as I have reduced mine.' They expect a reduction of 20 per cent in various departments. So a reduction of less than 50 per cent would not be very much. I think also that this is not a matter of any very great urgency so far as this sum is concerned in consideration of the urgency that we have to help the subordinate services as many of these officers are starving for want of increased pay. I think in consideration of our request His Excellency will lead by a little curtailment of his own personal convenience. I therefore move--

2. *That the provision of Rs. 55,000 for Government House furniture be reduced by Rs. 25,000 (Budget, page 62).'*

RAO BAHADUR A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I don't think that any member of this House would under ordinary circumstances grudge an addition to the Government House furniture. If in this year, however, it has been necessary to bring forward this resolution, it is because it has been felt that retrenchment ought to be effected in all possible directions to save some money to meet urgent demands. It will be remembered that at the time of the general discussion of the budget various members of this House expressed general agreement with the necessity for effecting retrenchment in all directions to provide for various other demands. It was this that induced us to examine the budget provisions as carefully as it was possible for us to do, and to suggest items of retrenchment with the hope that even small amounts like Rs. 55,000 for His Excellency's furniture when taken together would amount to a fairly big sum to cover some urgent demands.

"I will now place before the House a few figures to show that we are not too negligent of His Excellency's convenience since the expenditure on account of Government House furniture in 1916-17 was Rs. 27,523, in 1917-18 Rs. 22,397 and in 1918-19 Rs. 37,470. During those three years the total amount spent for Government House furniture was Rs. 87,390. Then during the year 1920 we have already had Rs. 1,30,620 and in 1920-21 Rs. 50,300, making up a total of Rs. 1,80,920. Therefore, comparing the expenditure during the previous three years before His Excellency took charge, we will find that the expenditure in those

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

[22nd March 1921]

three years, namely, Rs. 87,390, was more than doubled in these two years 1920 and 1920-21 alone when it has come to Rs. 1,80,920. It might be due to natural causes. Is it not therefore reasonable to suggest that while we have increased the expenditure under this head over the figures for the last three years to more than double that amount, we may as well halt here and try to see if we cannot effect any retrenchment in this direction? I know that contingencies may arise when probably some more expenditure may be incurred, but such expenditure as will be incurred will come in the revised estimate. In the ordinary circumstances, I would not grudge this amount, but I think, Sir, that we cannot in the present difficult financial situation go further than we have done. The Government have in these two years spent Rs. 1,80,920; and they may as well stop further expenditure on that account in the year to come and save Rs. 55,000 over this item. So I beg to move—

3. *That in the demand under 22-A (a) General Administration—Staff and Household of the Governor the grant of Rs. 55,000 proposed for Government House furniture be omitted (Budget, page 62)."*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"I beg to oppose this motion. His Excellency the Governor is not a public servant in the same manner as others are. He is sent out to be specially in charge of the Presidency and its administration. And what is paid to him is something like an allowance. He is the representative of His Majesty the King-Emperor. I suppose that any gentleman who has the welfare of the administration of the Presidency at heart would like to save as much as possible. But it is not advisable for this Council to refuse a grant because we have the power to vote, and in voting we should not interfere with matters which go to His Excellency's convenience and comfort. He can, since he has the welfare of the people at heart, provide much larger sums of money for the wants of the people. I am quite against the idea of interfering with any item concerning His Excellency's convenience apart from his staff and subordinate establishment."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I also beg to oppose this motion. The Government House furniture is not furniture that is being given personally to His Excellency, but it is furniture given to the Government House of this province. It is not necessary that all the Rs. 55,000 should be spent. Out of courtesy we allotted almost practically the same amount as was actually spent in 1920-21, Rs. 50,300. I therefore think that the amount of Rs. 55,000 should be allotted."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"I beg leave to oppose this resolution for this reason, that what appears to be a luxury to some is an absolute necessity to others. Again, Sir, I would ask my friends in this House to consider the fact that as His Excellency has to receive very eminent and distinguished visitors like M. Clemenceau and very big diplomats, what impression those visitors would have of the Government House when they come here, what impression they would have of the arts of India, what impression they would have of the civilization of this country, if they found the Government House not very artistically furnished. Therefore I say that some provision should be made. Secondly, one member said that His Excellency should set an example by curtailing his expenditure. Well, I say that he should certainly set an example, not of that sort, but that he should set an example to others by having his House well furnished for all the distinguished guests that come there. Then only the visitors who go there and see good things will carry a very good impression of the arts of India. I hope that my

22nd March 1921]

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

friends in this House who have studied art a bit and read what was done for art by Morris and his brotherhood in England will not grudge this trifle."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I have been all along in favour of retrenchment, but I feel bound to oppose this resolution. In the first place, we cannot dissociate ourselves from this consideration with reference to this resolution, viz., that there is a personal element involved in this though, I am sure, that my friend who moved this resolution and those who spoke in support of it were not influenced by personal considerations in moving this resolution. But the personal element is always with us. We cannot get rid of it. Then again, if this House votes in favour of this resolution, what is the effect of it? The effect of that would be to interfere with the personal comfort of His Excellency. I am sure that nobody in this House, including of course my honourable friends who have spoken in support of this resolution, wants in any way to interfere with the personal comfort of His Excellency the Governor. Again, Sir, with your kind indulgence and permission, I may be permitted to compare a very small matter with a very great matter. I had the privilege of being the Diwan of an important Indian State in Southern India and I think that the official residence of the Diwan of Travancore is comparatively well furnished. But it happened on certain occasions that very distinguished persons who were tourists and who were far above the Diwan of Travancore in social position visited the Diwan of Travancore in his official residence, and though the official residence of the Diwan of Travancore was to my mind well furnished, I felt ashamed, Sir, to receive those distinguished visitors when I was in charge of the administration. And when that was the feeling of an individual like myself, what must be the feeling of such an exalted personage as His Excellency who only the other day had to receive the third greatest personage in the British Empire, His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught (cheers). I believe it will be—may I use the word, Sir, 'improper', I do not in the least mean any disrespect to my friends—I believe it will be improper on the part of this House—not that I say that they have no right to do so—to vote in favour of this resolution."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with Mr. Krishnan Nayar in all that he has said. I may draw the attention of the House to one factor which has apparently not been considered, that when you are furnishing the Government House, you are furnishing a property which belongs to the Presidency of Madras. It is not like the duty allowance, it is not like the ordinary overseas allowance, it is not like the ordinary travelling allowance which go into the pocket of the person who draws it. It is merely a coincidence that it happens to be the residence of His Excellency the Governor. It is the residence not merely of himself, but is the State residence which the State provides for distinguished guests who come from all parts of the world. When we remember that in 1919-20 Rs. 1,30,000 had been spent and in the following year it was only one-half of that, to allow Rs. 55,000 this time is not a very great expenditure. We all make allowances for renewals and repairs to all public buildings year after year. When once we have done it, we don't neglect it for a number of years. It is true that during the years of war some sort of economy in this direction had been practised by the late Governor—he submitted himself to a self-denying ordinance; but that is no reason why when such a time of stress has passed that the ordinary renewals should not be made, a renewal in consonance with the dignified position of a State House for distinguished guests.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

[22nd March 1921]

“There is another reason also. My friend has referred to the fact that His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught had to be lodged there. It may be we are going to have the pleasure next year of receiving His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and on such an occasion, should not that House be furnished in a manner befitting the earliest British territory in India? Therefore it is that I say that it does not require very much argument for voting a small sum of Rs. 55,000 which is after all very much less than the Rs. 1,30,000 which we allowed two years previously.”

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, it seems to me that this resolution is quite inopportune and misconceived. It looks very much as if we are taking the pruning knife to a very wrong quarter. If the Government House needs furnishing, it needs to be furnished on a good scale. After the logical, cogent, persuasive and, I may add, eloquent speech made by Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar, I feel bound—and I think that the House will share my feeling, at any rate a large majority of this House—to vote against this resolution; and I think that instead of wasting any more time on the matter, the discussion on this resolution may be wound up and a decision come to forthwith.”

QADIR NAVAZ KHAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“Mr. President, I must dissociate myself from the member who has proposed this motion. As has been pointed out by several members, the Government House is a place which is intended for the residence of the highest authority representing the Crown and a place resorted to by eminent visitors. I have myself seen Government Houses in places like Travancore, Hyderabad and Baroda and I must confess that our Government House bears no comparison with them either in regard to structure or furniture. As another member said, in our anxiety to effect retrenchment we are putting our finger in a quarter which should be the least thought of. We must maintain it in a position suitable to the dignity of the institution and the dignity of the representative of the Crown. As my Hon'ble friend Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar referred, I have seen places like Baroda and others and I have also seen the furniture in the Government Houses there, but there is no comparison between these. As another member pointed out, the Prince of Wales may be visiting here and I have no hesitation in saying that the nature of the furniture we have got in the Government House is not at all suited to his dignity, so that the provision of Rs. 55,000 is absolutely necessary, and I would even persuade my honourable friend the mover himself to withdraw this resolution.”

RAO SAHIB U. RAMA RAO :—“Sir, in deference to the wishes expressed by my colleagues, I wish to withdraw this resolution.”

All the motions were by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

“4. That this Council resolves that the grant of Rs. 3,21,200 in 22-A (a) be reduced by Rs. 55,000, the cost of Government House furniture (Budget, page 62).”

MR. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Sir, the resolution which stands in my name runs as follows :—

5. That the lump provision of Rs. 26,000 for the purchase and repair of motor-cars included in 22-A (a) General Administration—Staff and Household of the Governor, be reduced by Rs. 20,000 (Budget, page 62).

22nd March 1921] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

"I will formally move it in order to know why this amount has been budgeted for."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"The reasons for this entry, Sir, are that the third car was necessary to make up the equipment sanctioned by the Secretary of State. I may add that the car was purchased before the visit of the Duke of Connaught. It is now in Madras and it will probably be paid for before the close of this year."

The motion was withdrawn by Mr. Narasimha Raju with the leave of the Council.

Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu did not then make the following two motions which stood in his name :—

6. *That in the demand under 22-A (a) General Administration—Staff and Household of the Governor—Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor the grant (Rs. 800) proposed for the purchase and maintenance of pictures be reduced by Rs. 400 (Budget, page 62).*

7. *That in the demand under 22-A (a) General Administration—Staff and Household of the Governor—Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor the grant (Rs. 8,000) proposed for other contingencies be reduced by Rs. 4,000 (Budget, page 62).*

The motions were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The Council will now adjourn and will meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow."

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS